

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY



125 888

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

FRANCE

Oxford University Press

London Edinburgh Glasgow New York

Toronto Melbourne Cape Town Bombay

Humphrey Milford *Publisher to the University*

FRANCE
MEDIAEVAL AND MODERN
A HISTORY

BY

ARTHUR HASSALL, M.A.

STUDENT OF CHRIST CHURCH, OXFORD

OXFORD
AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

1919

PREFATORY NOTE

To Mr. H. W. C. Davis and to Mr. C. E. Freeman I would express my sincere thanks for their kind and searching revision of the proof-sheets of this volume. Like all students of French History I must acknowledge a debt to the *History of France* by the late Dean Kitchin (Clarendon Press, 3 vols.) and to the *History of France* by J. R. Moreton Macdonald (Methuen & Co., 3 vols.). My acknowledgements are also due to Messrs. Bartholomew and C. Grant Robertson for permission to make use of the map of France 1814-1914 in their *Historical Atlas of Modern Europe 1789-1914* (Oxford University Press).

ARTHUR HASSALL.

LIST OF MAPS

Empire of Charlemagne	<i>facing page</i>	10
France at the Accession of Philip Augustus	PAGE	26
France by the Treaty of Brétigny	„	54
France in 1429	„	67
France, 1610-1715	„	130
Europe in 1810	„	236
France, 1814-1871	„	244

I

Roman Gaul: The Merovingians, 481-757

THE history of France from the Norman Conquest to the battle of Waterloo is to some extent the history of the rivalry of the English and French monarchies, though from the death of Henry II of France in 1559 to the opening of the war of the League of Augsburg in 1689, the two countries were for the most part at peace. From the accession of Charles of Spain to the Imperial throne as the Emperor Charles V to the present day—with the exception of the period from the opening of the Seven Years' War to the outbreak of the Revolution—France has always regarded the leading Power in Germany, whether Austria or, since 1866, Prussia, with suspicion if not with actual animosity.

In both cases she has had justification. The possessions of England in France down even to the reign of the English Queen Mary were a sufficient cause for exasperation, and after 1688 the colonial rivalry of the two Powers rendered hostilities frequent. Then shortly after the accession of the Emperor Charles V projects arose for the partition of France between him and Henry VIII, while during the Religious Wars in France the continued hostility of the Habsburg line in Spain, followed by the attempt of the Emperor in the Thirty Years' War to subject Europe to his sway, necessarily called forth the fiercest opposition in France. Till 1756 the two countries were frequently at war, and after the outbreak of hostilities in 1792 the French Government endeavoured to crush Austria—a policy pursued by Napoleon with considerable success.

From 1815 to 1914 peace between France and Austria was only once broken, but after 1866, when Prussia became the leading German Power, the old antagonism between France and Germany burst out with greater violence than ever. In this hostility to Germany France is fully justified.

The battle of Bouvines on July 27, 1214, was one of the most decisive battles fought in Europe in the Middle Ages. The battles of Ivry, of Valmy, and of Verdun have each had a determining influence in the history of France. The battle of Bouvines, however, has a special interest of its own, for it was due to that victory of Philip Augustus that the kingdom of France was firmly established, that 'the consolidation of her long-divided provinces under an absolutist monarchy' was secured, and that the seal was set upon the predominance of the House of Capet. This victory was won over German princes co-operating with rebellious French vassals.

In the history of France six of her monarchs stand out prominently: Philip Augustus, Philip IV, Louis XI, Henry IV, Louis XIV, and Napoleon. Other kings such as St. Louis, and ministers such as Suger, Sully, Richelieu, Mazarin, Choiseul, Vergennes, Carnot, Talleyrand, Thiers, Delcassé, and Clémenceau, are also to be numbered among those who at critical epochs in the history of France performed services for their country which have been fully recognized. But the six kings mentioned above are those who placed France in the forefront of the Powers of Europe.

During the centuries preceding the famous battle of Bouvines the formation of the kingdom of France had been checked by the inability of any one king after Charles the Great to establish his authority over the whole country, by the growth of feudalism in the ninth and subsequent centuries, and in the twelfth century by the accident of a large

portion of the land having come by inheritance or marriage into the hands of Henry II of England. Thus the firm establishment of a strong national monarchy over the greater part of the country which we know as France was a lengthy process.

That country was conquered between 121 and 51 B.C. by the Romans, who described it as Gallia (Gaul). The inhabitants were mainly Celts, though in the south-west of the country were Iberians, whose descendants are known as Basques, while in Massilia (Marseilles) were Greeks whose influence was supreme from Nice to Montpellier and far up the Rhône. At the time of the final conquest of Gaul by Julius Caesar (58-51 B.C.) the Germans, a fighting race from beyond the Rhine, were threatening to establish themselves in Gaul. The campaigns of Julius Caesar, however, destroyed their hopes and forced them back over the Rhine. The fall of Alesia and the capture of its defender Vercingetorix in 52 B.C. practically marked the close of Gaulish resistance, while in 49 B.C. Massilia suffered for its adherence to Pompey, its land being annexed to Gallia Narbonensis.

On the death of Julius Caesar (44 B.C.) the work of organizing Gaul was taken up by his successor, the Emperor Augustus. By his military and civil work Augustus not only brought about the Romanization but also the complete reorganization of Gaul. Gallia Narbonensis (south of the Cevennes), Aquitania, Lugudunensis, and Belgica were the four provinces into which Gaul was divided, and were ruled by Roman governors.

Till about A.D. 250 Gaul enjoyed a period of peace, which was followed by a longer one of war and confusion. For, from the year 250, invasions of Gaul by German tribes began, while at the same time independent emperors were set up by

4 *Roman Gaul : The Merovingians, 481-757*

the Roman armies on the Rhine. The Emperor Diocletian (284-305) did something to check the barbarian invasions of Gaul, and till the end of the fourth century the country remained Roman, enjoying no little prosperity.

The fifth century not only witnessed the fall of the Roman Empire in the West but also the settlement in Gaul of various German races such as the Visigoths, whose dominion about the year 500 extended from the Loire to Gibraltar, and from the Maritime Alps to the Bay of Biscay ; the Burgundians, who settled in south-eastern Gaul in the valleys of the Rhône and the Saone; and the Franks, already settlers in and soldiers of the Roman Empire, whose principalities centred round the present towns of Cambrai and Tournai.

THE MEROVINGIANS, 481-751

In 481 Clovis became King of the Franks, and a new epoch in the history of Gaul was opened. That remarkable man having overthrown, in 496, the Ripuarian Franks at Tolbiac near Strassburg, and having thus obtained supremacy over Germany as far as the Elbe, embraced Catholicism, his conversion being in no small measure due to the influence of his wife Clotilde and to Remigius, Bishop of Rheims. Henceforward he was the avowed champion of Christianity against the Visigoths and Burgundians, who had incurred the hostility of the Church by adopting Arianism. Though failing to expel the Burgundians from the Rhône valley, Clovis in 507, in defiance of Theodoric, the King of the Ostrogoths, defeated the Visigoths under Alaric II at Vouillé near Poitiers, and thus secured the subjection of Auvergne, Toulouse, and Bordeaux—in a word, extended the Frankish power from the Loire to the Pyrenees. He failed, however, to drive Theodoric from Provence and Septimania, a district

on the coast between the Rhône and the Pyrenees. His victory at Vouillé had brought him great fame, and the Emperor Anastasius bestowed on him at Tours the rank of Roman Consul, thus legalizing his conquests and enabling him to pose as the representative of the Empire. The success of Clovis was to a great extent due to his conversion to orthodoxy and to his attacks upon all heretics. He endowed monasteries, built churches, and advanced Christianity. In 511, the year of his death, he had summoned a council and died a professing Christian. But his Christianity was adopted for political ends, and his cruelties, so frequent in his later years, were, it is said, 'a fit prelude to the period' in which 'barbarism was let loose'.

From the death of Clovis in 511 to the death, in 737, of Theodoric IV is a period partly of disunion, partly of transition. Internal dissensions with occasional outbreaks of civil war mark the intervening years. The increasing weakness of successive Merovingian rulers grew more and more apparent, and gradually the Mayors of the Palace became all-powerful. At the time of the death of Clovis Christianity had triumphed in Gaul, and the Church was independent of the Empire. According to custom the kingdom was divided among the four sons of Clovis, with four capitals, Paris, Rheims, Orleans, and Soissons. After they had conquered the Burgundians and Provence, fratricidal wars broke out, with the result that from 558 to 561 Clotaire, the surviving son of Clovis, ruled over a united kingdom. On his death the kingdom was again divided among his four sons, and till 613 the country was the scene of interminable wars. One of the sons, Sigebert, married a remarkable woman, Brunhilda, who, while continuing friendly relations with the Church, showed statesmanlike qualities in that she aimed at abolishing 'the

6 *Roman Gaul : The Merovingians, 481-757*

fatal tradition of dividing up the kingdom'. After forty years' rule she was cruelly murdered. Her death implied a victory of the aristocracy; and during the next century and a quarter, in spite of the efforts of Clotaire II and Dagobert, who reigned from 629 to 639, the Mayors of the Palace in Austrasia (the eastern part of the Frankish dominions), Neustria (the western), and Burgundy steadily increased their influence. After Dagobert's death the Merovingian monarchy steadily weakened, and during the ensuing forty-eight years Neustria and Austrasia tended to become distinct states. In spite of the efforts of Ebroin, the Neustrian Mayor, who for a time raised Neustria to a paramount position in the Frankish dominions, the tendency of Austrasia and Burgundy towards independence was too strong to be resisted.

In 681 Ebroin was assassinated; and, after vain attempts on the part of Neustria to maintain its position, Pepin II of Herstal, whose father Pepin I had possessed vast territories, established his authority and that of Austrasia at the battle of Testry in 686. Till 752, when the Merovingian dynasty became extinct, the kings offered no resistance to the powerful mayors. On Pepin's death in 714 his illegitimate son, Charles Martel, a brilliant soldier, seized the supreme power and Austrasia finally triumphed over Neustria. His victories at Vincy near Cambrai (717) and at Soissons (718) over a mixed Neustrian and Aquitanian force under Chilperic II established on a stable basis the unity of Gaul and his own position as Mayor of the Palace. In 732 by his crushing defeat of the Arabs at Poitiers he saved Catholic Christianity, established the military supremacy of the Franks, and made himself supreme over the greater part of modern France. He was largely instrumental in introducing Christianity into

Germany by his successful expeditions into that country, which were followed by missionary efforts headed by the English Boniface. In conjunction with the Lombards, who had settled in Italy with Pavia as their capital, he drove the Saracens out of Septimania and Provence, with the exception of Narbonne. Unlike his successor he refused to support Pope Gregory III against the Lombards; in other words, to undertake responsibilities which belonged to the Emperor at Constantinople.

In explanation of the drastic policy which Charles was pursuing in Gaul towards the Church it should be stated that, as was the case in England in the opening years of the sixteenth century, a large amount of land had fallen into the hands of religious houses or of bishops. As in the reign of Henry II of England these ecclesiastical landowners endeavoured, usually with success, to claim exemption from the jurisdiction of the ordinary law-courts. Charles, however, had no hesitation in occupying the lands of abbeys and in treating bishoprics as ordinary Crown benefices. The clergy appealed to the Pope; but with the Lombards at its gates the Papacy had only the Franks to look to for aid, and so the complaints of the Frankish episcopate were ignored, and the Papal policy justified itself in the reigns of the successors of Charles Martel. Charles died in 741, and his twenty-two years of rule as Mayor of Neustria and Austrasia have been well described as the turning-point in the history of Western and Central Europe.

On his death his sons, Pepin III (the Short) and Carloman, succeeded to his position. But Carloman became a monk six years later, and in 751 Pepin, with the full approval of Pope Zacharias, deposed Childeric, the last Merovingian King, and took the royal title.

The Carolingians, 751-987

PEPIN's position was, however, by no means secure, and he was glad of the support of the Papacy. The Pope, Stephen II, was equally anxious to secure Pepin's aid against the Lombards, and so on July 28, 754, he anointed Pepin at Saint-Denis and thus strengthened his own position and that of the Carolingian dynasty. The same year Pepin made an expedition to Italy, compelling Aistwulf, the Lombard King, to submit. But in 756 Aistwulf besieged Rome, and Pepin again forced the Lombard to yield to him and to surrender to the Papacy the exarchate, Ravenna, and other towns—'the Donation of Pepin'. Both Pepin and the Pope had good reason to be satisfied. The former had formally established his dynasty and secured the support of the Papacy against any attempt to overthrow the Carolingian line, while his 'Donation' had paved the way for the establishment of the Holy Roman Empire in the reign of his successor. The remainder of Pepin's life was marked by successful wars in Germany (against the Saxons), and also in Aquitaine, which he brought into his kingdom. He died in 768, leaving the Carolingian monarchy firmly established.

In September 768 Charles and his brother Carloman divided Pepin's kingdom, Charles taking Austrasia, the lands between the Loire and the Garonne, and the greater part of Neustria, while Carloman ruled over Alemannia (Suabia), Alsace, Burgundy, Provence, and part of Aquitaine. In 769 Charles suppressed a revolt in Aquitaine, and strengthened

his position by alliances with the rulers of Bavaria and the Lombards. A confused period ensues. In December 771 Carloman died, and early the following year, on his brother's death, the reign of Charles the Great definitely began. In his reign the Carolingian became the most powerful monarch of the age. He lost no time in following his father's example and in identifying himself with Catholicism; and in 772, the year after Carloman's death, he carried out a successful military and religious campaign against the Saxons.

But affairs in Italy now demanded his attention. Hadrian had succeeded to the Papacy in January 772, and was at once attacked by Didier, the Lombard King. Though the Pope defended himself and Rome against a Lombard attack, his position was so critical that he sent an envoy to Charles begging for help. Anticipating the invasion of Italy in 1494 by Charles VIII, which also marked an epoch in the history of Europe, Charles at the head of a powerful Frankish army crossed the Alps and obtained the surrender of Pavia, the Lombard capital, in June 774, after a siege of nine months. The previous Easter Charles had visited Rome and had confirmed (with additions) the 'Donation' of Pepin to the Papacy; and, after the manner of Napoleon, he assumed the title of King of the Lombards.

In 778 he conquered Spain as far as the Ebro, though on his retirement his rearguard was destroyed by the Basques at Roncevaux, an event which was commemorated in the 'Chanson de Roland'. His ensuing campaigns against the Saxons, the Bavarians, and the Avars, lasted many years. From 795, the date of the conquest of the land between the Danube and the Theiss, the Frankish dominion extended far into the plain of the Danube, and with it Christianity spread, in great measure through the efforts of Bishop Aino of

Salzburg, which now became the metropolitan See of Bavaria.

Charles the Great had thus doubled the kingdom to which he had succeeded, and had given it a unity, both political and ecclesiastical, which it had not known since the days of the Roman Empire. The chief parts of the Western Empire were his, and all the German tribes had been brought into the power of a single ruler. His Empire extended from the Ebro to the Drave, and from the English Channel almost to the Straits of Messina. Thus the Frankish Empire had developed into a truly Imperial power in the West, and that at a moment when the Eastern Empire, after the deposition of the Emperor Constantine in 797, was in a sorry plight. An opportunity was thus given for the Bishop of Rome to sever the bond between him and his nominal lord and to recognize his real master—the Frankish King—as Emperor. Not gratitude but the presence of necessity drove the Papacy at last to recognize Charles as its lord. Without the protection of his Frankish lieutenant the position of the Pope, Leo III, in Rome itself would become untenable. The crisis arrived when Leo III fled to the camp of Charles at Paderborn.

On December 25, 800, at St. Peter's, the Pope, having crowned Charles as Emperor, threw himself at his feet and did him homage as his predecessors in the Chair of St. Peter had hitherto done to the Emperor at Constantinople. Charles the Great had now secured the victory of *Königsherrschaft* over *Volksberrschaft*, and had united all the German peoples to one another and to the already Romanized Germans. The Holy Roman Empire, which existed till 1806 with the Emperor as the sun and the Pope as the moon, and the various rulers in Europe as the stars, was now established. In this mediaeval Empire political and spiritual elements were intermingled, for

to the old belief of the Romans in the eternal duration of the Empire whose mission was to bring all nations into subjection to one law, was now added the Christian ideal of one universal fold under one ruler, that is the Catholic Church.

On his return from Rome Charles began his rule as Emperor of the West, expunging from his laws all that seemed opposed to the Divine ordinances, and sending out commissioners to impose a fresh oath of allegiance upon all. Ecclesiastical synods met only by his consent; he reformed the clergy, issued laws side by side with Papal rescripts, and took the position of chief councillor of the Pope. He thus became the instrument of the growing power of the Church, spiritual and temporal. In January 812 at Aachen envoys from the Byzantine Court formally recognized Charles as Roman Emperor, and henceforth it was universally recognized that there was an Emperor on the Rhine as well as on the Bosphorus.

The Emperor Charles the Great can thus be described as a Teutonic head who blended the German and Roman elements in his Frankish Empire. Napoleon, whose idea of forming a great Empire was in some ways similar to that of Charles, intended that Paris should be its capital. Charles, on the other hand, spent the last seventeen years of his life mainly at Aachen, died there on January 28, 814, in his 72nd year, having ruled for 46 years, and was buried in his own Church of St. Mary. France was profoundly influenced by his reign. He laid the foundations of her feudal system, and his provincial Governors in France were the ancestors of the great feudal families in Aquitaine, Brittany, Anjou, and in the other portions of the land which later became provinces in the French Kingdom.

The reign of Charles the Great, moreover, saw the begin-

ning of that educational work which continued through the ninth century, an age remarkable for learning and also for theological controversy. Alcuin, Einhard, and Paul the Deacon are three names which represent the learning and literature of this premature Renaissance. Alcuin's poems, his letters, and his professional writings are all full of interest. Einhard's life of the Emperor Charles gives a careful and historical account of the times in which the author lived, and his book is accurate and well arranged. Paul the Deacon, who came from Italy to the Frankish Court, returned after some years to the monastery of Cassino, where he wrote his History of the Lombards. Many other writers illustrate the learning of the Carolingian Age. Theodulfus, Bishop of Orleans, was the chief poet at the Court, and in one poem describes his experiences as *Missus Dominicus* in 798. We read also of two Italian musicians who were called by Charles the Great to his Court in order to improve the psalmody of the Frankish Church. In an age of constant warfare these evidences of the interest taken in learning are not a little remarkable, and give a pleasing picture of the spirit of the Dark Ages in Charles's lifetime.

For France one point of interest in the career of Charles the Great is that both the Emperor Charles V and Napoleon endeavoured to carry out a similar object. The ideal of all three monarchs was the establishment of a great European Empire which should take no account of nationalities. It must, however, be remembered that Charles the Great's Empire 'was laid on the rock of the Church', and Charles V would have similarly insisted on the obedience of all his subjects to the Pope. Napoleon, on the other hand, paid little regard to religion except for political purposes, and one cause of the Peninsular War was the dread of the influence of the atheistic Jacobins in Spain.

The period from the death of Charles the Great in 814 to the accession of Hugh Capet is marked by the rapid dissolution of the Frank Empire. The period is, however, important, as it witnessed not only the gradual growth of France as a separate kingdom with Paris as its capital but also the development in France of the feudal system. Nevertheless, to the peoples of Western Europe the promise of spring had been succeeded by the night frost. The difficulties of the monarchs who ruled during this period were caused partly by the attempts of the greater feudatories, such as the Duke of Brittany (who gained his object by the Treaty of Angers in 851), to maintain their independence of the royal power, and partly by the invasions of the Northmen, who already in 810 had suffered their first defeat at the hands of Charles the Great. That Emperor had been succeeded by his son Louis the Debonaire, whose reign was chiefly occupied in attempts to satisfy the demands of his three sons for portions of his Empire. On his death in 840 in the throes of a civil war his eldest son Lothaire became Emperor and, being anxious to preserve unity, claimed the whole Empire. His two brothers Charles and Louis (who advocated a division of the Empire) therefore attacked him, and inflicted on him a decisive defeat at Fontanet-en-Puisaye in June 841; and in the following year, at Strassburg, they swore to continue in their opposition to the Emperor. Lothaire was forced to yield, and in 843 agreed to the final partition of the Empire, which was arranged by the Treaty of Verdun—in the terms of which, it is said, is to be found ‘the germ of France and that of Germany, as well as the germ of the long disputed barrier State between the two’.¹ For Charles, the third son of Louis the Debonaire, received

¹ J. R. Moreton Macdonald, *A History of France*, vol. i, p. 32 (London: Methuen).

the West Frankish and purely Romance lands, Neustria, Aquitaine, Flanders, Brittany, North-West Burgundy, Septimania, and the Spanish March. His brother Louis was restored to his East Frankish dominions, i.e. all the Teutonic lands east of the Rhine, which included the wine districts round Mainz, Worms, and Speier, while the Emperor Lothaire kept the old kingdom of Italy, and also ruled over the middle kingdom sometimes called Lotharingia, which extended from Frisia to Lombardy and included the greater part of Burgundy province and the cities of Rome, Pavia, Arles, and Aachen. Though this middle kingdom was destined to disappear, an attempt was made to revive it in the reign of Louis XI by Charles the Bold, the ambitious Duke of Burgundy.

Thus the idea of the Imperial theocracy had perished and the traditional mode of succession—the division of the patrimony among the sons—in the Frankish monarchy had prevailed. In the history of the development of the French and German nationalities the Treaty of Verdun is of immense importance; for Neustria and Austrasia were never again united save for a short period under the ephemeral Empire of Charles the Fat. The ensuing forty years afford, it has been said, ‘but a history of unions and partitions’.

Charles the Bald lived till 877, surviving his two brothers and several of their successors. His reign includes the most confused period in French history, and consequently is a difficult one to describe. In itself the growth of feudalism, or in other words the existence of a number of quasi-independent barons, some of whom enjoyed the title of king, demanded his full attention. Till his death Charles was in constant difficulties. The rulers of Brittany, Aquitaine, and Septimania aimed at securing complete independence of the

French King. On his attempting to secure possession of Aquitaine in 844 Charles encountered at Toulouse a fierce resistance from his nephew Pepin, whose father, Pepin, King of Aquitaine, had died in 838.

Forced to raise the siege he came to terms with Pepin in June 845, and by the Treaty of Fleury-sur-Loire divided Aquitaine with him. In 848 Charles seized Toulouse, and from 850 to 852 war raged, and only ended when Charles captured Pepin and placed him in a monastery.

Aquitaine, however, continued contumacious, and a number of the inhabitants refused to recognize the son of Charles as king. In 851 Charles was compelled to recognize the independence of Brittany, but no sooner had he ended his unsuccessful struggle than he had to face the invasion of his southern dominions by the son of his step-brother, Louis the German, in 854, who had sent an army to aid the Aquitanians in their resistance to Charles. Peace was arranged between them in 860 at Coblenz, and Charles was able to take measures to resist the Northmen who since 841 had constantly invaded France. In 841 they had pillaged and burnt Rouen, and in 845 and 857 Paris had fallen into their hands. From 862 to 867, when the invasions ceased for a while, Robert the Strong, Count of Anjou and governor of the country between the Seine and the Loire, successfully resisted the onslaughts of the Northmen. Charles had withdrawn to Laon, leaving Robert, the great-grandfather of Hugh Capet, to defend Paris.

In 866 Robert was killed in battle, and was succeeded by his son Odo, Count of Paris. Meanwhile the two younger sons of Lothaire, the brother of Charles the Bald, had died (Charles in 863, Lothaire II in 869), and the eldest one, the Emperor Louis II, the ruler of Italy, was involved in a war

with the Saracens. Charles the Bald and Louis the German thereupon, by the Treaty of Mersen in 870, divided Lotharingia, the former obtaining parts of modern Holland, Belgium, Lorraine, and Burgundy. France thus obtained the Romance portions of Charles the Great's Empire. In August 875 the Emperor Louis died, and Charles hurried to Rome and received the Imperial crown at the hands of the Pope, John VIII, being crowned at St. Peter's on Christmas Day. The new Emperor soon found himself at war with Louis the German, who was infuriated at the success of Charles in obtaining the Imperial crown. Louis, however, died at Frankfort on August 28, 876, but his son Louis defeated Charles at Andernach on October 8 of the same year. A year later (October 6, 877) Charles died on Mount Cenis, having reigned as king thirty-seven years.

By granting to Robert the Strong the borderland threatened by the Northmen, and by retiring to Laon, he had unwittingly performed a signal service to Europe, for in saving Paris, in 885-6, Odo the Count of Paris had created France. In 887 Charles the Fat, who inherited Neustria in 884 on the death of Carloman, abdicated and Odo was crowned King of the West Franks. His reign was marked by wars with the Danes, with the powerful nobles, and with Charles the Simple, son of Lewis the Stammerer, who had ruled Neustria and Aquitaine from 877 to 879 (being succeeded by Louis III and Carloman). Odo died in 898 and Charles the Simple became King of the West Franks, ruling till 929. His reign was in many ways of great importance. In 912 he joined Lotharingia to France, and in 911, by the Treaty of Clair-sur-Epte, he handed over to Hrolf the Viking the land which was soon known as the Duchy of Normandy.

In the year 920 Robert, Duke of France, the younger son

of Robert the Strong, with other barons, rebelled, and though Robert died in 923, the great vassals soon afterwards renewed their rebellion and proclaimed Rudolf Duke of Burgundy king, seizing Charles and throwing him into prison. Though Charles was four years later released, it was only to be again captured by Rudolf and starved to death at Péronne. Rudolf himself died in 936 and was succeeded by Louis d'Outremer, son of Charles the Simple and Eadgifu, daughter of Edward the Elder. On his accession he was living in England at the Court of Athelstan. He showed vigour as a king, though he was not strong enough to hold his own against Hugh the Great, son of Robert, Duke of France, and father of Hugh Capet. He died in 954 and Hugh in 956. The two last Carolings, Lothaire and Louis V, showed no capacity—they both quarrelled with the Church, while Lothaire also alienated the Emperor. On the death of Louis V in 987, without any sons, Hugh Capet was elected King of the French.

The Capetians, 987-1328

THE revolution of 987 was effected to the satisfaction of the Church, and henceforward the House of Capet at crises in its history was to find the Church a most invaluable ally. For, during the reigns of the early Capets, feudalism was rampant, and the royal power could only secure its objects by diplomacy. Hugh Capet's reign proved a fresh starting-point in the history of the land which developed under Philip Augustus into the powerful kingdom of France. France had become divided among a number of strong fiefs, and of these Hugh Capet held one of the most important, so that 'the new dynasty saved the monarchy by strengthening it with a great fief'.¹ An additional source of strength was the alliance with the Church, which regarded Hugh's accession as a triumph for herself.

The history of the first four Capets is of little interest. Robert the Pious did indeed augment the royal demesne by adding lands on the south-east and north-west, and Henry I, by procuring the coronation of his son at Rheims, confirmed the hereditary right of the Capets to the French throne. Henry was a brave and active man, and endeavoured—though without success—to defeat William of Normandy. The reign of his son Philip I, who succeeded him in 1060, is chiefly notable for the conquest of England by the Normans in 1066 and for the commencement of the struggles between England and France, which, with certain respites, continued for many years, and became a dominant feature in French

¹ Tout, *The Empire and the Papacy*, p. 73.

foreign policy. He did, indeed, by the purchase of Bourges, establish the royal power south of the Loire. Though possessed of much shrewdness, he quarrelled with the Church, which was then governed by the masterful and statesmanlike Gregory VII and reinvigorated by the Cluniac reforms. Philip I, it is said, was the last of the early Capetians who reigned without governing. Still, before his death he had come to terms with the Papacy on the Investiture question, and the 'Chanson de Roland' had indicated the future of France.

Thus Philip's reign contained many points of interest. It was moreover remarkable for the conspicuous part that Frenchmen played in the First Crusade, which was decreed at the Council of Clermont-Ferrand in November 1095. A crusade had been urged upon Europe by Gregory VII. It was left to Urban II to revive Gregory's project in a more popular form. Philip's brother, Hugh of Vermandois, aided by Robert of Flanders and Stephen of Blois, commanded the royal vassals; Godfrey of Bouillon, Duke of Lower Lorraine, the men from northern France; Raymond IV, Count of Toulouse, those from the south; the Italian contingent was led by Tancred and his uncle, Bohemond of Tarentum, who were partly Norman by birth. In July 1099, after many adventures, Jerusalem was in their hands, and a close commercial connexion was established between the East and Western Europe. It is difficult to over-estimate the importance in the history of France of this and the succeeding crusades. Henceforth 'France stands out as a real nation endowed with glorious and peculiar national qualities'.¹

¹ Moreton Macdonald, *A History of France*, vol. i, p. 106 (London: Methuen).

National feeling had thus asserted itself, and France was now on the way to become a great consolidated State. The feudal system was sensibly weakened, for the energies of the great barons were now diverted from domestic ambitions and directed towards the East. Would the House of Capet continue the policy of Hugh and Robert, the first kings of their line, and preserve a close alliance with the Papacy, which under Gregory VII and his successors had asserted its spiritual independence? Like Henry I of England, the Capetians made a compromise over the question of investiture, and thus obtained the support of the Church in their struggle with the feudal forces.

Louis VI came to the throne in 1108, and his reign is a notable one in the early history of France. Already for some years he had enjoyed the supreme power owing to the feebleness of his father, and had held his own fairly well against the attacks of William Rufus. On his accession 'the downward progress of the French monarchy came to an end', and at the close of his reign the prospects of the Capetian House were much improved. The policy which he steadily pursued during his reign was not an ambitious one. To recover the demesnes which his predecessors had lost, and to bring into close relation with the Crown the vassals and towns in the Isle of France—these were the objects at which he aimed and which by the time of his death he had carried out. The elevation of the monarchy at the expense of feudalism, the suppression of many of the lesser feudatories, the foundation of new towns, the emancipation—whenever possible—of the industrial and agricultural classes, were all achieved during Louis' reign.

Early in his reign Louis VI showed a sound political instinct in closely allying himself with the Church. His aim was to

lessen the power of the feudatories, especially the lesser ones 'who were the real scourges of the country', and to consolidate the royal domains. As far as possible he maintained peace at home; for it was necessary to watch carefully the Anglo-Norman King Henry I, who had conquered Normandy in the battle of Tinchebrai in 1106 and with whom he was at times compelled to enter into hostilities. The first of his wars against Henry was closed to his disadvantage by the Treaty of Gisors (1112); the second, which was even more unsuccessful, ended in 1120 after his defeat at Brémule. In this year, however, Henry lost his only son, William, in the wreck of the White Ship, a disaster of more than domestic importance, as it raised a difficult question about the succession to the throne.

Not long afterwards a rebellion against the English King burst out in Normandy. It was supported by Fulk of Anjou, whose second daughter married William Clito, son of Henry's brother Robert—a marriage which was declared by the Pope null and void. As the Emperor Henry V, in alliance with the English King, moved troops to the Rhine, thus preventing Louis from aiding the Norman rebels, Henry of England was able in 1125 to crush the revolt. In 1126 Henry's daughter Matilda, the widow of the Emperor Henry V, was declared the future Queen of England, and shortly afterwards, in January 1127, William Clito married the French Queen's sister and renewed his claim on Normandy. But in August 1128 Clito was killed, and the following year Matilda married Geoffrey, son of Fulk of Anjou. Thus the continental position of the Norman kings was greatly strengthened.

When Louis died in 1137 he had earned a well-merited renown as the opponent of feudalism, the protector of the peasants, and of the growing communes in the towns.

Above all he had shown himself the supporter and protector of the Church, which was now taking part in the famous twelfth-century Renaissance. That Renaissance had many sides. In France its chief centres were Laon, Paris, and Chartres. The Paris schools, which were rendered famous by their connexion with Abelard in the first half of the twelfth century, eventually developed into the University of Paris. This philosophic awakening was accompanied by the appearance of many popular heresies; the most celebrated of these was embraced by the Albigenses, among whom flourished the Troubadours. Abelard himself was silenced about 1140 by the Councils of the Church, which was deeply alarmed at the growth of a spirit of scepticism; and scholasticism triumphed till it was itself treated with contempt by Louis XI. But scholasticism could not check the marvellous development in architecture which marks the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and of which such buildings as the Sainte Chapelle and Rheims Cathedral are examples.

The reign of Louis VII, who succeeded his father in 1137, saw a serious set-back in the steady progress of the Capetian monarchy. At first, indeed, the prospect was encouraging. Louis had married Eleanor of Aquitaine, who owned vast possessions in the west and south-west of France. A quarrel with the Papacy was healed by the efforts of St. Bernard, and in 1144 he secured Gisors, the important fortress on the borders of Normandy which William II had captured in 1079. But, unlike his predecessors, he most unfortunately decided to organize a crusade, the idea of which appealed to his adventurous and restless nature. If the work of the early crusaders was not to be entirely sacrificed it was certainly necessary for assistance to be sent to Jerusalem. But it would have been better for France if Louis had left the leadership

of the crusade to others. As it was, St. Bernard supported the movement with his matchless eloquence, and in the summer of 1147 a combined Franco-German army started for Palestine. The expedition was a failure, though Louis himself, with his wife Eleanor, reached Jerusalem. He returned in 1149 estranged from his wife, whom he divorced three years later. During his absence the Abbot Suger had administered France with great skill. He had kept the peace, he had encouraged the various industries of the kingdom, the relations of Church and State were on a satisfactory footing, he had saved money. Under him 'the kingdom enjoyed continuous prosperity, and reached a high pitch of splendour'. On the King's return Suger retired and died at St. Denis in 1151. The remainder of the reign presented a striking contrast to the period of Suger's administration, and at one time it seemed as if France would suffer a permanent set-back in her steady progress. For in 1152 Eleanor of Aquitaine, shortly after her divorce from Louis, married Henry Plantagenet, who, in 1154, ascended the English throne.

The English King was now supreme in Normandy, Maine, Touraine, Aquitaine, and, soon after his accession, in Brittany and Anjou. Louis had moreover been compelled to agree to the marriage of his daughter Margaret to Henry's eldest son, and to cede the Norman Vexin and the important frontier fortress of Gisors, which he had recovered in 1144. Danger also threatened him from the eastern frontier, as the Emperor Frederick Barbarossa might at any time form a coalition with Henry II and seize the old kingdom of Lotharingia. The position of Louis was indeed serious, for Henry II aimed at founding a great continental Empire with himself as King of France, but there

were some relieving features. On the death of his second wife Louis married Constance of Castile, who bore him a daughter and died in 1134; shortly afterwards he married Adela of Champagne, and she bore him, in August 1165, a son, the famous Philip Augustus. Moreover, he formed a close alliance with the Pope Alexander III and throughout his reign had the invaluable support of the Church—a support the importance of which it is impossible to overrate, especially as the murder of Becket in 1170 destroyed the friendly relations of Henry II with the Pope.

From that time Louis' fortunes steadily improved. Though his position had seemed at one time most serious, the successful defence of Toulouse in 1159 had shown that he could, even then, hold his own against Henry. Moreover, the birth of an heir to the French Crown in 1165 was a blow to the aspirations of the English King. And what in reality rendered Henry's ambitions unobtainable was the unanswerable fact that 'the whole claim of the English kings to rule in France was an anachronism, an attempt . . . to ignore the ever-growing forces of nationality'.¹ Difficulties indeed Louis had to meet after 1170, both with the Emperor Frederick Barbarossa and with Henry II. But in 1173 the English King was faced with a rising of his barons in France and England which had the support of the Kings of Scotland and France. Louis had taken a leading part in the coalition against Henry in France, but failed to capture Rouen. Had it not been for the intervention of the Pope he would have been unable to come to terms with Henry in 1177 by the Treaty of Ivry. In 1179 he visited the tomb of Thomas à Becket at Canterbury in order to pray for the recovery of his son Philip, who was seriously ill. This journey was one of Louis' last acts

¹ Moreton Macdonald, *A History of France*, vol. i, p. 125.



as king, for at that time he was suffering from the effects of a paralytic attack. On his recovery Philip was crowned on All Saints' Day 1179, and in 1180 Louis himself died.

Philip's marriage took place a few months before his accession on April 28, 1180, to Isabel, daughter of the Count of Hainault, and niece of the powerful Count of Flanders. In June 1180 he made a treaty with Henry II; and in 1185, after a short quarrel, he obtained a great accession of territory from Philip of Flanders, namely Vermandois, with the district of Amiens. After some years, marked by uneasy diplomacy, Philip found himself in 1189 at war with Henry II, whom he defeated, capturing Le Mans and Tours. He and Henry II then met, and two days afterwards the latter, the greatest of the Angevins, died at Chinon. Philip's position was now assured. Before, however, he could resume his work the news of Saladin's victories in the Holy Land checked the national movement in France. A crusade was at once preached, and having made a treaty of peace with Richard I, Philip set sail from Messina on March 19, 1191. The crusaders captured Acre, and at the end of the year he was back in France. The crusade was merely an episode in his career.

A year later he showed what his real policy was, for he claimed the greater part of Normandy with several castles. He soon had the important castle of Gisors in his hands, and he attempted to seize Rouen. On Richard's return from his Austrian prison in March 1194 France and England entered upon open hostilities, which were at times suspended, at times renewed. In 1198 Richard formed a powerful coalition against Philip, and till the English King's death at Chaluz on April 6, 1199, Philip's fortunes were at a low ebb. The accession of John to the English throne marked the definite turning-point in Philip's reign. Arthur, the nephew of John,

FRANCE
AT THE ACCESSION OF
PHILIP AUGUSTUS

English Miles



was supported by the barons in Anjou, Maine, and Touraine, and for a time Philip was weakened by the excommunication of the Pope on account of his bigamous marriage with Agnes of Meran. That excommunication was removed nine months later, but Philip was not reconciled to his lawful wife, Ingeborgis, till 1213. In 1202 John was summoned to Paris at the instance of the nobles of Poitou, and as he did not appear Philip declared that he had lost all the lands which he held of the French Crown. John also refused to yield to Arthur his French fiefs and to give the satisfaction which Philip had demanded. War at once broke out; Arthur's 'disappearance' in 1203 cleared the way for Philip's projects; in March 1204 the Château Gaillard was in French hands; Rouen surrendered on June 1, and with its surrender Normandy was no longer English. In 1206, Philip being now in possession of Brittany, a truce was signed for two years, which period Philip, we are told, spent 'in consolidating his conquests and securing his position in Europe'. The struggle with John was by no means over; for John obtained the support of several of Philip's vassals, such as Reginald of Boulogne and Ferrand, Count of Flanders. Early in 1213 (May) Philip, anticipating Napoleon, assembled a fleet at Boulogne for the invasion of England. The Pope, however, accepted John's submission and Philip marched into Flanders, defeating Ferrand and taking Ghent, Ypres, Bruges, and Cassel. The Earl of Salisbury, on the other hand, destroyed the greater part of the French fleet, and in 1214 Philip was attacked by John in Poitou, and by a formidable coalition near the Flemish frontier. There, on July 27, 1214, was fought the battle of Bouvines. Baldwin IV of Flanders had taken part in the Fourth Crusade, and on his death Ferrand of Portugal had married the heiress of

Flanders and now supported John. Against Philip were assembled not only the forces of the Emperor Otto IV and of the Count of Flanders, but also troops from Holland, Boulogne, Lorraine, and an English force under the Earl of Salisbury. Luckily, Prince Louis had already driven John from the Loire, and there was now no danger of a flank attack on Paris from the west. Philip was thus able to concentrate all his efforts upon his opponents in Picardy. In the battle Guérin proved himself a born general and Philip showed considerable military talent, and though his forces were inferior to those of his opponents, he determined to attack them. He was justified, for the French cavalry won the day, throwing the opposing infantry into complete disorder. The results of the battle testified to its importance—Salisbury was captured, as was Ferrand of Portugal, the Count of Flanders, and Reginald, Count of Boulogne; Boulogne surrendered; Flanders was in French hands. Philip now held in undisputed possession Normandy, Maine, Anjou, Touraine, Poitou, Saintonge, Auvergne, St. Omer, Aire, and the County of Meulan. For Central Europe the result of the battle was the deposition of Otto IV and the recognition of Frederick II as Emperor. ‘Few medieval battles’, writes Mr. Davis, ‘were so far-reaching in their consequences as Bouvines, to which England owes her Magna Carta, Germany the magnificent and stormy autumn of the Hohenstaufen dynasty, France the consolidation of her long-divided provinces under an absolutist monarchy.’¹ Bouvines was certainly one of the decisive battles in the history of Europe.

Before Bouvines had been won Philip had strengthened the monarchy by an active and persistent policy towards the

¹ *Medieval Europe*, by H. W. C. Davis, p. 159 (London: Williams & Norgate).

feudal forces which hitherto had stood in the way of progress. In doing so he was following unintentionally the policy which Henry II had so successfully carried out in England. 'During his reign the monarchy of the Frankish kings consolidated its powers, strengthened its foundations, and looked round as a sovereign rather than as an equal upon the feudalism which had so long been dominant.'¹ Like his predecessors he carefully preserved the hereditary alliance of his House with the Church, though his attitude was marked rather by independence than servility, as was evidenced by an Ordinance in 1220 which in its tone can be compared with the Constitutions of Clarendon. Allied with the Church and the people, and aided by the absence of many of the great barons owing to the Crusades, Philip withstood and defeated all attempts of the feudal baronage to weaken his position.

Like Henry I and Henry II of England, Philip throughout his reign continued to develop a centralized system of government, reconstructing the local administration, and by means of *Prévôts*, 'the local representatives of the monarchy', in the north of France, and of *Baillis*—officials superior to the *Prévôts*—he closely linked the local and the central administrations. The *Prévôts* collected the royal revenue, the *Baillis* saw that it was honestly collected, and moreover they wielded wide judicial powers. In the south the duties which the *Prévôts* and the *Baillis* performed in the north were carried out by hereditary officers chosen from the great families who were known as 'seneschals'. Like Henry I and II, Philip had thus strengthened the central administration, gradually reducing the power of the holders of the five traditional posts—the Chancellor, the Seneschal, the Butler, the Chamberlain, and the Constable. This

¹ Hutton, *Philip Augustus*, p. 112 (London: Macmillan & Co.).

process had been initiated by his grandfather ; Philip reduced the powers of three and practically abolished two of these officials, substituting in their place lesser barons chosen on account of merit, who were reinforced by *novi homines*, lay and clerical. As in England a Great Council was summoned occasionally for the discussion of serious questions ; as in England a smaller body, a *Curia Regis*, composed mainly of lawyers, dealt with judicial business, but had no fixed place of meeting. Connected with the *Curia Regis* there grew up the Court of Peers composed of six great barons and six great churchmen.

Philip also continued the policy of his father Louis in creating and favouring towns as a counterpoise to the power and influence of the local barons. *Villes nouvelles* grew rapidly, and conduced to the steady decline of feudal influence. Philip had no hesitation in giving the towns his full support. Various types of urban constitutions existed, and by his encouragement and alliance with the towns Philip 'prepared for his grandson the period of subjugation by which the towns became the absolute property of the Sovereign'.¹ By thus supporting the towns and by constantly founding new communes 'he raised up a new estate pledged to alliance with the Crown'; and from the close of the twelfth century that alliance between the Crown and the Third Estate continued. Perhaps the best illustration of his policy to towns is found in his treatment of Paris. Both Louis VI and VII had fully realized the importance of the capital city, which under Philip was developed to a marvellous extent, so that he has justly been called 'the founder of the mediæval Paris'. Thus in his reign France underwent a transformation which was completed under Louis IX and Philip IV. By his interest

¹ Hutton, *Philip Augustus*, p. 150.

in commerce, by his grants of communal privileges, by his support of the universities, especially of the University of Paris, Philip conferred untold advantages upon the French kingdom, and it is no wonder that the literary men of his day compared him to Charles the Great. The support given him by the communes in the decisive battle of Bouvines illustrates the trust and confidence placed in him by the towns.

After the battle of Bouvines Philip returned to his early project of invading and conquering England, and in May 1216 his son Louis landed and entered London. But John's death in October destroyed the French plans. Henry III, a child, was supported by the English barons, and having suffered reverses on sea and land Louis accepted a large sum of money, signed a treaty at Lambeth in September 1217, and retired.

While Philip was busy annexing John's French dominions in the north of France, a crusade had been preached against the brilliant civilization of the Albigenses by Innocent III in 1208—a crusade marked by the most terrible massacres and cruelties. In 1207 Raymond VI, Count of Toulouse, had been excommunicated, and in 1209 a French army commanded by Arnaud Amalric, the Papal legate—an army representing 'the brutal and avaricious feudalism of the North'—began operations in the Rhone Valley, aiming at the conquest of Languedoc. Raymond in despair submitted to the Pope, but his nephew, Raymond Roger, led the resistance, which was concentrated at Béziers and afterwards at Carcassonne. On the capture of these places, and the massacre of the inhabitants that followed, Raymond himself, in spite of his submission, was besieged in Toulouse. To save him, the King of Aragon, Pedro II, led an army across the Pyrenees, but was defeated and killed in the battle

of Muret by Simon de Montfort, to whom the organization of the conquered territory had been entrusted. Raymond was captured and deposed, and the greater part of his territories, including Toulouse, was handed over in 1216 by the order of the fourth Lateran Council to Montfort, who was killed in 1217 while suppressing a rebellion in Toulouse. In spite of the efforts of Amauri, the son of Montfort, aided by Louis, the eldest son of Philip, and notwithstanding a terrible massacre of the inhabitants of Marmande, the attempt to reduce Toulouse was a failure; and at the time of Philip's death (July 14, 1223), though the royal demesne had been largely increased during his reign, the south-west of France was not conquered and the distinctive national feeling in that portion of France was as yet not eradicated.

On Philip's death his son, who had been compelled to renounce his claim to the English throne by the Treaty of Lambeth in September 1217, ascended the French throne as Louis VIII. His wife, Blanche of Castile, was the daughter of Alfonso IX of Castile and Eleanor, daughter of Henry II of England, and proved to be a ruler of considerable capacity.

As a revenge for his rebuff in England Louis in 1224, the truce with England having expired, claimed Poitou. War ensued, and at its close in 1225, while Gascony remained in the hands of the English, Poitou, Limousin, and Périgord were held by the French King.

He was equally anxious to renew the Albigenian Crusade, to which in 1225 the Pope, Honorius III, gave his full approval. Amauri de Montfort resigned his claims to the French King, the English Government acquiesced, and in May 1226 Louis led a large force against Avignon, which offered a stubborn defence. On its fall he attempted, but failed, to capture

Toulouse, and died at Montpensier on November 8, 1226. His reign, though brief, was important in that it saw the completion of much of the work begun by Philip Augustus. The English hold on the south of France was sensibly weakened, and the lands there that now acknowledged the supremacy of the French Crown were of considerable extent. Toulouse and Guienne, however, preserved their independence, though that of the former was distinctly precarious. 'He had', it is said, 'done enough for the monarchy by the great march which had brought home to the Languedoc the majesty of the Capetian king.'¹ Though he began the policy, which proved in the future to be so opposed to the interest of the Crown, of bequeathing large fiefs to his four sons, he had increased the royal domain and checked feudal supremacy.

The accession of Louis IX (Saint Louis) in 1226 found France benefiting from the reign of Philip Augustus. The process of defeudalization was rapidly proceeding, and Matthew Paris may be pardoned for describing the King of France as 'the King of earthly kings'. If the position occupied in Europe by Philip Augustus and Saint Louis be compared with that held by John and Henry III of England, it will not be denied that the thirteenth century represents for France a golden age. Paris was now, owing to the efforts of Philip Augustus, who built the Louvre, a capital of which any country might well be proud. Notre-Dame, begun in 1182, was completed in Saint Louis' reign. Louis VII had built Saint-Denis; Saint Louis built the Sainte Chapelle.

As Louis was only twelve years old when he succeeded his father in 1226, the government devolved upon his mother, Blanche of Castile. She had at once to face a coalition of

¹ Tout, *The Empire and the Papacy*, p. 407.

nobles anxious to take advantage of a minority in order to advance their own interests, and to secure their feudal independence. The position was somewhat similar to the position in England in 1173; for then Henry II secured, as Blanche did in 1226 and 1227, the support of the official class. But the opposition which confronted Blanche was far less dangerous than were the English malcontents in 1173; for Philip Augustus had smitten the feudal nobles with such vigour that there was little fear of any serious combination against the Crown, and in 1227 the chief of the disaffected barons came to terms with the Regent in the Treaties of Vendôme. The following two years, which gave Blanche much anxiety, were of no little importance in the history of France. For in 1229, after the suppression by the Crown of a rebellion by Philip Hurepel, bastard brother of the late king, Raymond VII of Toulouse made the Treaty of Paris (or Meaux) with Blanche, handed over Toulouse and other fortresses, promised adherence to the Catholic Faith, and agreed to spend six years on a crusade. As Louis IX's brother Alfonse, Count of Poitou, was already betrothed to Jeanne, the only daughter of Raymond, it seemed not unlikely that eventually the royal house would succeed to the Toulouse heritage. Gradually all traces of the Albigensian heresy disappeared, the Inquisition was set up, and Dominican friars became supreme.

No sooner was the Albigensian episode brought to a close than Blanche found herself at war with England; and in May 1230 Henry III, hoping to take advantage of the feudal reaction in France, at the head of an army landed at St. Malo, and marched through Brittany to Poitou and on to Bordeaux. In August he marched back to Brittany and in October reached England. The Poitevins on whom he relied

had proved faithless; and on July 4, 1231, a three years' truce was concluded between France, Brittany, and England.

In 1236 the regency of Blanche came to an end on Louis attaining his majority. That regency had been most advantageous to France. The English invasion had failed; the Count of Toulouse had surrendered; the Crown on the death of Hurepel in January 1234 controlled the succession in Flanders; many fiefs had been added to the royal domain; the marriage of Louis in 1234 to Margaret of Provence introduced French influence into the Rhône Valley. Saint Louis was in many ways remarkable. Handsome, brave, chivalrous, pious, and always anxious for the well-being of his people, he ruled France with success, showing a shrewdness of judgement and a firmness of will which remind one of the qualities exhibited by Philip Augustus. While Europe was torn by wars and quarrels such as that between the Emperor Frederick II and the Papacy, France under her peaceful and capable monarch was, to a great extent, secure from hostile attacks, and her prosperity steadily increased. Unlike Henry III of England, Louis adopted a firm attitude towards the increasing claims of the Papacy; in 1269 he limited the power of the Pope in France and checked the invasion of the Franciscan and Dominican monks. His policy towards internal troubles, usually the result of baronial ambitions, was in striking contrast to that adopted by the English King.

In 1242 the south of France was in rebellion in support of Raymond, Count of Toulouse, who had refused to do homage to Louis' brother Alfonse on the latter's assumption of his apanage in Poitou and Auvergne. Henry III seized the opportunity to land in France, and on July 22, two days after a skirmish at Taillebourg, he suffered a severe defeat at Saintes. Louis, however, 'in the teeth', says Joinville, of

the advice of the Council, accepted Henry's proposal for a truce for five years; and in January 1243 the Count of Toulouse agreed to the Treaty of Lorris, which renewed the Treaty of Meaux. In 1249, on Raymond's death, Alfonse succeeded to his lands, and the definite inclusion in the kingdom of France of Aquitaine and Toulouse, inhabited by descendants of the Visigoths, was an accomplished fact.

In 1244 a severe illness led Louis to take the Cross and to vow that he would lead an expedition to Palestine, Jerusalem having been lost by the Christians. At peace with England, and secure against all baronial disorder, Louis, like Richard I, felt no anxiety with regard to his kingdom during his absence.

At Cluny, in November 1245, he met Innocent IV, whose co-operation in the proposed crusade he hoped to secure, if only an end could be put to the interminable struggle between Pope and Emperor. With Innocent he arranged that Charles of Anjou, Louis' youngest brother, should marry Beatrice, the heiress of Provence. This marriage, which took place in 1246, was destined to add to France land east of the Rhône, valuable as making France complete on the south-east. In 1248, however, there was no sign of a cessation of the struggle between Pope and Emperor, and accordingly Louis set out upon the Seventh Crusade from Aigues-Mortes on August 28.

The expedition wintered in Cyprus, and the following spring Louis captured Damietta, which he entered on June 7, 1249. His choice of Damietta as a base for operations was not a fortunate one, and his delay of six months before beginning operations proved disastrous. His success in the battle of Mansourah in February 1250 was followed by the outbreak of famine and disease in his army, and by his surrender to

the Saracens. After promising to surrender Damietta, to give the enemy a large sum of money, and to observe a truce for ten years, Louis was released and allowed to retire to Saint-Jean-d'Acre, where he remained four years. His mother, the Regent Blanche, on hearing of his release, had urged him to return to France. His return was all the more necessary as in 1251 the rising of the 'Pastoureaux' took place—a movement of peasants against the Church, the bishops, the priests, and the monks. At Orleans they massacred twenty-five priests; but at Bourges they were attacked by the Regent's forces, their leader killed, and the movement suppressed.

During Louis' absence important events had happened in Europe. In 1250 the Emperor Frederick II had died, his death being followed by the disruption of the Empire. From that time the decadence of the free Italian communes set in. Small despotic dynasties gradually arose in Italy, with the result that at the close of the fifteenth century Italy had lost all hope of freedom and was an easy prey to the foreigner. Towards the close of the year 1253 Blanche died, and Louis on hearing the tidings returned to France; after an absence of six years he reached Paris in September 1254, in time to entertain Henry III, who was on his way home from Gascony. During the next few years he settled the succession questions concerning Flanders and Champagne; and in 1258 he effected also a settlement—with considerable advantage to France—with regard to the south-west of France. By the Treaty of Corbeil an arrangement was reached with the King of Aragon. Louis abandoned all the ancient claims of the French Crown over Barcelona and Roussillon—claims dating from the time of Charles the Great; and the King of Aragon abandoned his pretensions to Provence and Languedoc.

In 1259 Louis found another opportunity of gratifying his love of peace and of benefiting France, for in that year (December) he made with Henry III, 'his pious neighbour', the Treaty of Paris. Henry renounced his claims on Normandy, Maine, and—more important still—on Poitou, and agreed to become the French King's vassal for his remaining possessions in France. In 1262 Henry was again in France for six months, and on his return to England became deeply engaged in a quarrel with the barons. Both parties agreed to accept the King of France as arbitrator, and the Mise of Amiens (January 24, 1264), which annulled the Provisions of Oxford, was the result. Such a reactionary decision was not acceptable to Simon de Montfort, and the Barons' War followed. Meanwhile, Italian affairs were demanding the attention of the French King. Shortly after the conclusion of the Treaty of Paris Charles of Anjou, who owned Provence, accepted from the Pope the 'Two Sicilies' (Sicily and the kingdom of Naples), which since 1258 had been ruled by the illegitimate son of the Emperor Frederick II, Manfred, whose daughter Constance had married Peter III of Aragon. In the battle of Benevento in 1266 Manfred was killed; and Charles of Anjou remained master of Naples.

In 1270 Louis set out on his last crusade, and landed at Carthage in July under the impression that the conversion of the ruler of Tunis would help towards the recovery of the Holy Places. On August 25 he died at Tunis.

In 1269, before he started on his last expedition, he limited the power of the Pope in France and brought the clergy under the law of the land, as Henry II of England attempted to do by the Constitutions of Clarendon. In this, as in many other respects, Louis showed an independence of the Papacy which in the seventeenth century was manifested by Louis XIV

The establishment of the Inquisition in France and its support by the State illustrate Louis' religious devotion and his hatred of heresy. It also proved of no little advantage to the State from its confiscations of property. In 1273 appeared the *Établissements de Saint Louis*, a collection of customs then in force. The publication was wrongly attributed to the King. During the reign, partly owing to the Fourth Crusade and its establishment of a Latin Empire in Constantinople (1204), an increasing interest in Greek books and the Greek language made itself very apparent in Paris—an interest which was more widely diffused in the sixteenth century. Joinville's *Histoire de Saint Louis* gives an interesting picture of the King and his doings, and emphasizes his great sanctity, his love of justice, and his regard for order. It, however, omits to point out the continual discontent of the towns, which, under a less able administrator, would have been even more apparent. The statement—the result of cool historical investigation—that the reign was an age of reaction is correct.

Louis' son, Philip III (Philippe le Hardi), reigned from 1270 to 1285. At home he continued the policy of his predecessors, his aim being to hasten the decay of feudalism and feudal institutions. In his time a commoner could become a noble at the wish of the King and could, like the nobles, possess fiefs. His policy left its mark on the political map of France. Philip's first wife, Isabella of Aragon, had died during the crusade in which Philip was engaged when he came to the throne, and in 1274 he married the Princess of Brabant, who was apparently a capable woman. The death of Alfonse of Poitiers and his wife Jeanne about the same time should have brought to England, in accordance with the Treaty of Paris in 1259, the Agenais and

Saintonge south of the Charente. Philip, however, showed no intention of recognizing the treaty, and in the summer of 1272 firmly established the royal power in the south-west by seizing Languedoc. In 1271 he yielded to the Pope's demands and handed over to him the *Comtat Venaissin*, close by which lay Avignon in Provence, so important during the greater part of the following century. He also conciliated Edward I by surrendering to him the Agenais, and to his Queen (Eleanor of Castile) Abbeville and Ponthieu.

The reign witnessed important events abroad. Charles of Anjou ruled so tyrannically in Sicily that the inhabitants of Palermo rose, and on March 30, 1282, the famous 'Sicilian Vespers', massacred all the French there. The revolt spread over the whole island; Peter of Aragon, whose wife had hereditary claims, was accepted as ruler; and Sicily remained united to his House, or to the Spanish Crown, till 1713. The King of Aragon had, however, for some three years to withstand the efforts of the French to regain the island. Charles now hastened thither, besieged Messina, which he failed to take, and witnessed the defeat of his fleet at the hands of Roger de Loria. In spite of the fulminations of the Pope, Martin IV, and of the renewed efforts of Charles, the French fleet was defeated on two more occasions; and Charles, yielding to rage and despair, died on January 5, 1285, his death being followed within three months by that of Martin IV. To avenge this defeat of the House of Capet Philip invaded Spain and laid siege to Gerona. On his return to France he was seized with illness and died on October 5, 1285, at Perpignan, being succeeded by Philip le Bel, the last great Capetian monarch.

During this critical period in the history of France it is as difficult to realize the character of the King as it is easy to realize that of Edward I. Like many absolute monarchs, such as Louis XI, he chose men of obscure origin to be his ministers. Early in his reign Philip entered upon a quarrel with Edward I and occupied Guienne in 1294, thus indicating what was to be the policy of his successors till in 1453 Calais remained the only French territory in English hands. War with England necessarily involved friction with Flanders, which almost from the Norman Conquest had close trading relations with the English people. The Count of Flanders realized the imminent danger from France, as he had suffered a period of imprisonment at Philip's hands, a defeat in the battle of Furnes, and a temporary desertion by Edward I, who agreed to the Truce of Yve-Saint-Baron in October 1297, but he found that his subjects insisted upon the renewal of commercial relations with England. The Count was deposed, and the Flemings boldly faced the inevitable invasion by the French.

Early in 1301 there seemed little chance of Philip relaxing his hold on Gascony; but in 1302 a change took place in his attitude, owing to this revolt of the Flemings and their defeat of the French forces under Robert of Artois on May 18 at Courtrai. At the same time the Pope, Boniface VIII, renewed his struggle with Philip; and in December 1302 Bordeaux threw off the allegiance of the French Crown and called in the English. Involved in all these embarrassments Philip moderated his tone; and in 1303, on May 20, the Treaty of Paris closed the long series of disputes between him and Edward I. Gascony was restored to Edward, who agreed that he or his son would do homage for it. In 1304 a French army did indeed overthrow the Flemish forces in the battle

of Mons-en-Pevèle; but Philip, realizing the stubborn character of the Flemings, agreed in 1305 to the Treaty of Athis (which was only partially carried into effect), by which he secured a large sum of money and the substitution of the son of the deposed Count as the ruler of Flanders.

Philip was now free to devote himself to his great struggle with the Papacy, and in Boniface VIII he found an opponent as determined as himself. After the long contest between the Popes and the Empire, which began in the time of Hildebrand and closed with the defeat and death of Frederick II, the Papacy had triumphed. That triumph was in great measure due to a close alliance with the Kings of France, though the failure of Charles of Anjou in Sicily had been a set-back to the realization of their Italian aims. Nevertheless, Boniface was resolved to carry out the policy of Gregory VII in its entirety, and entered into his famous conflict with Edward I and Philip. In 1296 he issued his Bull *Clericis laicos*, forbidding the clergy to pay subsidies to their temporal rulers. Edward gained his way by 'inventing the ingenious plan by which subsidies were called voluntary gifts', but Philip simply refused to allow money to leave his kingdom and was supported by public opinion in France. Involved as he was in a struggle in Italy, Boniface for a time moderated his claims, but after the year 1300, when jubilee pilgrims thronged to Rome from all parts of Christendom, he entered into his second contest with Philip. Public feeling was again aroused in France, and to strengthen his position Philip summoned, early in 1302, an Assembly of the Three Estates of the Realm. This meeting had been preceded in England in 1295 by Edward's famous Parliament, but the history of the French Assembly was far different from that of the English Parliament. Philip's Assembly gave full support to the King's anti-

Papal policy, and it met again in 1308 and 1314. Boniface, however, showed no intention of yielding, and the struggle continued with violence, the Pope appealing to foreign courts. At length a French emissary (Nogaret) of the King entered Italy and with a small force captured Boniface at Anagni. But this action had no lasting result, for the Pope's supporters drove out Nogaret and bore Boniface to Rome, where in October he died, being succeeded by Benedict XI, a man of pacific disposition. A year after his death French influence procured the election (1305) of Clement V, under whom the great struggle came to an end. Philip had triumphed. In 1309 Clement took up his residence at Avignon, where the Popes resided for nearly seventy years, the period of the 'Babylonish Captivity'.

It now only remained for the French King to anticipate the policy of Richelieu towards the Huguenots and, in the case of the Knights Templars, to check once and for all the danger of an *imperium in imperio* in France. Like the Jews, who were about this time being expelled from England, the Templars formed 'a wealthy and powerful republic within the Kingdom'.

Threatened with the fate of Boniface VIII by a French emissary, Clement declared against the Order, which was suppressed under circumstances of great cruelty in 1312. Philip had again triumphed, the ascendancy of the Crown over the Church and the French nation was assured, and before his death French institutions were thoroughly organized. Of these institutions the *Parlement* of Paris was specially important; till its abolition at the time of the French Revolution, it played a noteworthy part in the history of France, always asserting itself when the monarchy was weak. It became prominent in the later years of

Philip's reign, when the *Conseil du Roi*, which henceforward dealt mainly with political matters, transferred its financial duties to the *Chambre des Comptes*, and much of its judicial work to the *Parlement* of Paris, which divided its business among three Courts—the *Grand' Chambre*, the *Chambre des Requêtes*, and two *Chambres des Enquêtes*. The first of these heard important appeals and cases affecting peers, royal officers, and members of the *Parlement* itself; the second dealt with cases of minor importance; and the *Chambres des Enquêtes* considered appeals before they reached the *Grand' Chambre*. In the *Grand' Chambre* was a *lit* on which sat the King to hold a 'Bed of Justice' on solemn occasions, such as when he wished to compel the *Parlement* to register edicts to which it was opposed: for that body till the French Revolution steadily claimed its rights to register edicts and, if it wished, to remonstrate.

The firm establishment of this body and that of the States-General would suffice to mark the reign as one of singular importance. But, like his contemporary Edward I, the French King 'extended the principle of national taxation to the Church as well as to the feudal nobility'.¹ Throughout his reign Philip seized every opportunity of raising money, large sums being obtained from the spoliation of the Jews and from the suppression of the Knights Templars. By means also of direct and indirect taxation, loans (which were seldom repaid), and subsidies, he established the finances of the monarchy on a firm basis. The year before his death leagues had been formed to resist the royal taxation, and Philip, like Edward I when in a similar situation, had to yield to the storm. On November 29, 1314, he died, leaving historians the difficult task of estimating his character, though his works would imply determination and cunning.

¹ *A History of France*, p. 197.


The reign of this king (1285-1314) marks a distinct epoch in French history. The feudal system having been practically destroyed, it was necessary to replace it by a new administrative system which entailed drastic reforms, judicial and military. The reign was also of great importance both in the political and in the constitutional history of France. It saw the famous alliance with Scotland established—an alliance which practically continued till the days of John Knox and the establishment of Presbyterianism. It saw also some definite progress in the slow but gradual expulsion of the English from south-west France. The struggle between France and the Papacy was ended by the election of a French Pope in 1305 and the settlement of the Papal Court at Avignon in 1309. On the other hand, the French monarchy failed to acquire full sway over Flanders. To sum up, the chief interest of his reign is that, just as the reign of Edward I of England marks the beginning of English parliamentary history, so that of Philip marks 'the final stage in the transformation of France from a feudal to a monarchical kingdom'.¹ In 1312 the dissolution of the Order of the Templars marked the removal of the last obstacle to the triumphal progress of the monarchy.

The reigns of Philip's three sons—Louis X (1314-16), Philip V (1316-22), and Charles IV (1322-8)—with whom ended the House of Capet, call for little comment. The opposition in several localities to the heavy exaction to which they had been subjected in the last two years of Philip's reign caused Louis X to grant their demands. Louis was to a great extent ruled by his uncle Charles of Valois. On his death in 1316, he left a daughter Jeanne, by his first wife

¹ J. R. Moreton Macdonald, *A History of France*, vol. i, p. 193 (London: Methuen).

Margaret of Burgundy; the question was whether she or his brother Philip should succeed. The supporters of Jeanne, headed by Burgundy, claimed the crown, but Philip's claim was successfully upheld by an important Assembly in Paris. Thus the principle of the Salic Law which, in the case of the Salian Franks, forbade a woman to hold the crown was upheld. Five years later Philip died, and his brother Charles's reign, which ended in 1328, was one of little importance.

THE LATER CAPETIANS




*The Valois Line and the Hundred Years' War,
1328-1483*

As Charles IV left only a daughter born shortly after his death, Philip of Valois, the son of Charles, the brother of Philip the Fair, became king on May 29, 1328. During the reigns of his three predecessors, popular assemblies had frequently met; but there was little chance that the States-General would emulate the English Parliament, owing first to the fact that these assemblies did not represent the inhabitants of the provinces, and secondly, to the division of the assembly into three classes, and thirdly, to the jealous attitude, which was apparent down to the French Revolution, of the upper classes towards the *Tiers État*. At any rate the outbreak of the Hundred Years' War completely destroyed any hopes of the establishment of a constitutional government, such as existed in England, in the kingdom of France.

In March 1327 peace had been signed with England by Charles IV. It was, however, manifest that Philip the Fair's policy of securing Gascony would be steadily continued. The accession of Philip of Valois made no break in the policy of absorbing the English possessions in Guienne and Gascony. To facilitate that policy Philip supported David Bruce, who had sought his help, while Edward III supported Balliol. The fact, too, that Robert of Artois, with whom Philip had quarrelled, had found a refuge in

England tended to increase the bad relations of the two countries. In 1336 the Count of Flanders, the ally of the French King, stopped all commercial relations between his country and England. As long as Philip was resolved to incite the Scottish nation and the Flemish Count to worry England, in order that he might on the first opportunity drive the English out of the south-west of France, war was inevitable.



The immediate object of Edward, when war actually broke out, was to free Flanders from all danger on the side of France, so that the invaluable trade between Flanders and England might be restored. Moreover, the defeat of the French would end his running fight with the Scots. The Flemish people were on the side of England, as they were suffering severely from the stoppage of commercial relations; but their Count was in alliance with the French King, and by his aid had crushed all opposition hitherto. In 1337 Edward found an ally in the Emperor Lewis IV, while Philip was in alliance with Scotland, with John of Bohemia, with the King of Castile, with the Pope John XXII at Avignon, and on John's death with Benedict XII.

In May 1337 the Hundred Years' War definitely opened with Philip's declaration of his sovereignty over Guienne, the reply to which was Edward III's claim in October to the kingdom of France, his arrival in Antwerp in the following year, his siege of Cambrai, and his adoption of the arms of France in order to satisfy James van Artevelde and the Flemings. A treaty with the latter followed, and trade between England and Flanders was resumed. In June 1340 Philip suffered another reverse. His fleet was disastrously defeated in the battle of Sluys, and for many years England was supreme in the Channel.

Till the summer of 1345 the French cause was by no means hopeless. The English lost the support of many of their allies, who reconciled themselves with the French King; in July 1345 van Artevelde was killed by a Flemish mob; in 1340 Edward III, isolated and at variance with his Parliament, made a truce. Moreover, Edward's intervention in Brittany, where the question of the succession

to that Duchy had been raised, ended in January 1343 in the Truce of Malestroit, which left Philip in a strong position. The resumption of serious hostilities could not, however, be averted; Philip was as determined as ever to oust the English from Guienne, and it was there that the war definitely reopened in the summer of 1345, the Earl of Derby being opposed by Philip's eldest son John, Duke of Normandy, whose failure against the English force seemed to justify Edward III's invasion of France from the north in July 1346. Edward's famous march to Paris and then towards Flanders has often been described. Having a superior force, Philip anticipated that he could crush the English King, but when the two armies met on August 26 at Crécy, Edward was victorious over the French, while in October Philip's allies, the Scots, suffered a decisive defeat at Neville's Cross. These disasters to the French cause were followed next year (August 4, 1347) by the loss of Calais, which remained in the hands of the English till 1558. The following month the Truce of Calais was agreed upon, which nominally lasted for four years. During two of these, 1348-9, France was decimated by the Black Death.

For some years after the expiration of the Truce of Calais warlike operations continued on sea and land. In fact, in Aquitaine and Languedoc, fighting from 1348 was almost incessant, while in August 1350 a famous naval battle was fought off Winchelsea. It was a kind of anticipation of the defeat of the Armada in 1588. Philip's reign has been rendered famous by the chronicle of Jean Froissart. Unlike Philippe de Commines, who in the next century gives such an accurate picture of the reign of Louis XI, Froissart ignores the miseries suffered by the mass of the people during the reign, and simply

describes the pageantry of an age of dying chivalry. To him Philip is a representative knight of chivalry, whose chief delight was to devise brilliant tournaments at Vincennes.

Of the risk incurred in waging war with an antiquated military machine Froissart reckes nothing; he devotes his pages to describing the decaying feudal system as though it would continue for ever. Philip purchased in 1349 Montpellier and the province of Dauphiné; and on August 21, 1350, shortly after the battle off Winchelsea and his marriage with Blanche of Navarre, he died.

Owing to the good offices of Clement VI's legates, a real attempt to bring about peace was made at Guines in April 1354. The French, however, refused the proposed terms, and the war continued. In October 1355 Edward landed in France; while he was campaigning in Artois, the Prince of Wales, who had landed the previous month at Bordeaux, raided Languedoc, and on September 19, 1356, won the battle of Poitiers, taking prisoners King John and his youngest son Philip, the future Duke of Burgundy. Early in 1357 a truce was arranged to last till 1359, and in the meantime John was carried off to London. Both the English and French nations were now weary of the wars. In October 1357 David of Scotland agreed to the Treaty of Berwick, and in January 1358 the captive French King accepted the preliminaries of peace. In March 1359 John signed the Treaty of London, but it was rejected by the Dauphin, who was Regent, and in the following November Edward undertook to make a fresh attack from Calais on the French nation. He failed to take Rheims, and in April 1360 he besieged Paris. Being again unsuccessful he agreed to consider the question of peace.

Meanwhile, the internal condition of France was chaotic,

and the difficulties of the situation were accentuated by the intrigues of Charles of Navarre, known as Charles the Bad, who was little else but a bold, clever traitor. He was the son of Jeanne, daughter of Louis X, whose claims to the crown had been set aside by Philip VI; he possessed not only Navarre but also estates in the Seine and Eure valleys and the county of Évreux. He had married a daughter of King John; but his close connexion with the King did not prevent him from acting treasonably in Normandy, of which the Dauphin Charles was duke. In April 1356 Charles the Dauphin seized and imprisoned Charles of Navarre; on September 19 the battle of Poitiers was fought; and in October the States-General met in Paris, where Étienne Marcel, the Provost of the Merchants, had assumed the government of the city, and favoured a regency under Charles of Navarre, whose liberation was loudly demanded. On the presentation of a list of reforms the Dauphin retired from Paris; but on his return, January 1357, he agreed to the demands of Marcel and the Estates, which were embodied in the *Grande Ordonnance* in March. These demands implied the distinct weakening of the monarchy. In April the reformers received the unexpected news that John had agreed to a two years' truce, and had ordered the dissolution of the Estates. Nevertheless, they met again in November, and were strengthened by the support of Charles the Bad, who had escaped from prison, and till May the following year carried all before them. Alarmed at this attitude and at the murder of one of his servants, the Dauphin had at first yielded to all their demands; but early in 1358, he adopted the policy which Mirabeau in 1790-1 urged upon Louis XVI, and withdrew the States-General to Compiègne. Paris was now, as in 1871,

opposed by the provinces, always jealous of the influence of the capital. The Paris reformers, a small though determined body, took advantage of the rebellion of the lower classes known as the Jacquerie, which had the support of Marcel. Charles the Bad defeated the rebels near Meaux, but continued his alliance with Marcel and his traitorous correspondence with the English King. In July 1358 the crisis ended with the murder of Marcel, and with the admission of the Dauphin into Paris, where the bulk of the population was on his side.

The Dauphin, supported by the growing national feeling in France, took immediate action. John's negotiations with the English were repudiated, and he made an arrangement with Charles of Navarre. Consequently Edward III, when he again invaded France in 1359, effected little, and retreated from the neighbourhood of Paris.

On May 8, 1360, preliminaries of peace were signed in the village of Brétigny, and peace was finally secured at Calais on October 22. All Aquitaine (including Poitou, Saintonge, Périgord, Angoumois, Limousin, Quercy, Rouergue, Agenais, and Bigorre) was to be English, as also was the County of Ponthieu. The pale of Calais, which included the County of Guines, remained in the hands of the English King, as also did the Channel Islands. The French King renounced his alliance with the Scots, and Edward renounced his with the Flemings. Almost immediately after the conclusion of peace John was released.

John's reign had been uniformly unfortunate. He lived at a time when military capacity was above all things the quality required, and John had no military capacity. Evil advisers surrounded him, and he never seems to have realized the absolute necessity of, at any rate, making an

FRANCE BY THE TREATY OF BRETAGNY

English Miles

0 50 100 200

English Possessions shaded thus 
Boundary of France 



attempt to unite all his vassals round the throne. His misfortunes apparently failed to teach him wisdom; after his return to France, for the last three years of his reign, instead of endeavouring to restore order in the country which was being overrun by the 'free companies', he laid heavy taxes on his subjects, and wasted the money in various extravagances. Shortly before his death the Duchy of Burgundy became part of the kingdom of France, owing to the death of its duke without heirs; and in September 1363 the greater part of the Duchy was conferred on his younger son, Philip 'the Bold', the first of the great Burgundian dukes, who in the next century became such formidable rivals of the French kings. The marriage, too, of his daughter Isabella to a member of the Visconti family was important as bringing about an early connexion between France and Italy. Finding that he was unable to pay to Edward III the arrears of his ransom, he returned to England in January 1364 and died on April 8.

The accession of Charles V was an event of the utmost importance to France, for as long as John lived there was little hope of any recovery for France from her miserable condition. Though Charles was not in any sense one of the great kings of France, he fully merited the title of the Wise, for he had indeed shown considerable skill in his dealings with Étienne Marcel and his supporters. In some ways he resembled Louis XI, and, being physically weak, was, fortunately for France, unable to emulate his grandfather and his 'Knights of Chivalry', who had failed so conspicuously in the war with England.

France on his accession required not only complete internal reorganization, but also a revolution in the methods of war. Charles's ordinances dealing with taxation, the

suppression of private warfare, justice, and police, were in accordance with the advice of wise councillors, while in his military reforms he followed the advice of Du Guesclin. That able soldier recognized that the feudal system of warfare was out of date, and that war was a business which had to be paid for. An organized army under the King was the first necessity. Its establishment would enable France to avenge Crécy and Poitiers, and to meet her enemies with a good chance of success. Frontal attacks by the undisciplined forces of feudal chivalry had now to give way to more methodical and scientific methods.

At his accession bands of 'free companies', partly English and partly French, ravaged the land. They formed, indeed, a most formidable force, and one of Charles's first duties was to devise some method by which the country might be relieved of the presence of these marauding hosts, who later might be induced to join a regular, well-paid army.

Till 1365 Du Guesclin was fully occupied in the north of France. Charles the Bad had rebelled, claiming the Duchy of Burgundy; but on May 16, 1364, his forces were defeated by the French general in the battle of Cocherel, after which success Charles was crowned at Rheims. Navarre held lands in Normandy which he successfully defended, and it was not till the following year that his differences with the French King were temporarily settled. Simultaneously with Navarre's rebellion fighting took place in Brittany, over the interminable question of the Breton succession. The death of Charles of Blois, the French candidate, on September 29, 1364, in the battle of Aurai, gave John de Montfort the dukedom; and a satisfactory arrangement was made between him and the French King by the Treaty of Guérande in April 1365. These two

difficult matters being disposed of, Charles and Du Guesclin were able to turn their attention to the question of the 'free companies'. Fortunately, a civil war had broken out in Spain; and at the close of 1365 Du Guesclin united the 'free companies' and led them into Spain to support Don Enrico in his struggle with his half-brother, Pedro the Cruel, for the crown. In April 1366 Du Guesclin was successful and placed Don Enrico on the throne of Castile. Early the following year, Don Pedro, supported by the Black Prince, regained his throne, and Du Guesclin was captured. But the indirect efforts of the campaign in Spain were ultimately most beneficial to France, for when in 1368 the English troops returned to Bordeaux, much diminished by sickness, Don Pedro was left without allies. Consequently in 1369 another French force attacked Don Pedro, who was killed in battle, Don Enrico thus acquiring the throne.

In 1368 the Black Prince was again battling with the French, war having been declared in May. The situation in France had greatly improved during the eight years of peace, and an anti-English feeling had already shown itself in Gascony. Moreover, Charles was allied with Castile and Portugal, and was on friendly terms with the Emperor Charles IV (in whose reign the famous Golden Bull named definitely the seven Electors to the Empire), while the marriage of his brother Philip of Burgundy to Margaret, heiress of Flanders, which effected an alliance between that country and France, tended to strengthen the position of the French monarchy. It only required the massacre of Limoges, ordered in September 1370 by the Black Prince, to crown the unpopularity of the English in the south-west. Disaster on disaster overtook the English


cause. In 1371 the Black Prince, owing to illness, had to return to England; in June 1372 the English fleet, under Lord Pembroke, suffered defeat³ at the hands of a combined Franco-Spanish fleet off La Rochelle; in September the English lost Poitiers and La Rochelle, and before the year was over the treachery of Duke John of Brittany was rewarded by the occupation of his Duchy by Du Guesclin. In 1378, however, Charles found himself in danger of a fresh rebellion in Brittany. The Duke John was, therefore, restored to his dukedom in 1379, much against the will of the French King. The following year, John of Gaunt, who had in 1369 marched through Normandy, advanced through Burgundy, arriving eventually at Bordeaux with his troops decimated by the cold and the hardships which they had encountered. Du Guesclin, now Constable of France, saw with satisfaction the success of his tactics. By refusing to give battle to the English forces, by sallies from fortified towns, by using cavalry for guerrilla warfare, he had enormously strengthened the position of France in its war with England. In 1374 the capture of a strong English position in Normandy (Saint-Sauveur-le-Vicomte) put a finishing touch to the English disasters. Shortly afterwards, at the instance of the Papacy, the English and French kings agreed to sign a truce at Bruges on June 27, 1375, which was continued till June 1377. England still remained in possession of Calais, Brest, Bordeaux, and Bayonne. The first portion of the Hundred Years' War was now practically ended.

In 1378 Charles discovered that Charles the Bad was renewing his intrigues; and with the aid of the Comte de Beaufort, his rival's son, he secured the possession of all the fortresses in Normandy (except Cherbourg) which were

held by his enemy. In Pampeluna Charles the Bad was besieged by a Castilian force, and compelled to cede several of his castles in Navarre. He died in exile in 1387. In July 1380 Du Guesclin, who had been engaged in suppressing a rising in Languedoc, died, and two months later the King followed him to the grave. During Charles's reign France welcomed the despotism that he had set up, and the States-General met only once. In many ways, apart from the war, his reign is noteworthy. The building of the Bastille was begun in 1369; he enriched the royal library of Paris, which he practically founded; he built many castles near Paris; he was the patron of men of letters. At his death England held in France only Calais and a small portion of Guienne.

In the Middle Ages it is difficult to overestimate the effect upon a country of a capable sovereign. Under Philip VI France suffered terrible calamities; under Charles V she rapidly recovered. Under a young or incapable monarch a country in those days, when the nobles often lacked a sense of patriotism, and had little thought for the welfare of the people, ran great risk. Such was the case of France on the death of Charles V; for his successor Charles VI was only twelve years old, and a few years after his accession was visited by periodic attacks of lunacy. Consequently the power was wielded throughout the greater portion of his reign by his uncles, of whom the most important were the Dukes of Anjou and Burgundy, the former acting as Regent, the latter controlling the household, while the Duke of Berry, who had no influence, governed Languedoc and Aquitaine. The Duke of Bourbon, brother-in-law of the above three princes, was associated with Burgundy in the control of the household.

During the first two years of the reign France, England, Flanders, and Germany were in a state of unrest. Wat Tyler's rising in England, the supremacy of Philip van Artevelde in Flanders, the rising of the Parisians who forced Anjou to abolish the *gabelle* (salt-tax) and to make other extensive concessions, the formation in Germany of Leagues of the Towns, all illustrated the opposition of the people to the feudal nobles. However, in most of the countries affected the royal power asserted itself, and feudalism triumphed. In February 1382 a revolt in Rouen against a new duty was crushed, but it was not till May that a serious insurrection in Paris—the revolt of the Maillotins—was suppressed. Peace being restored in Languedoc, in Rouen, and in Paris, Louis, Duke of Anjou, departed with a large force to Italy, for he had been adopted by his cousin Joanna, Queen of Naples, as her heir. After some fighting in Italy he died in 1384, leaving Philip of Burgundy to a great extent supreme in the royal councils.



Burgundy was not long in adopting an active foreign policy. Flanders for some two years had been in a state of

unrest, and Ghent, under Philip van Artevelde, had risen against its Count, Louis of Flanders. The Count had appealed to his father-in-law, Philip of Burgundy, who with the King and a powerful force invaded Flanders and met the Flemish army under Artevelde on November 27, 1382. The battle of Roosebeke—so called after a village—proved a decisive victory for the French. Thousands of Flemings, including Artevelde, perished, one result being the complete suppression of all seditious attempts in Paris against the Government. Another result of the victory of the King was that the cause of Clement, the French Pope, was strengthened as against his rival Urban, the Roman Pope.¹ A rapacious and selfish aristocracy was now supreme in France, much to the detriment of the country. In January 1384 the death of the Count of Flanders brought Philip of Burgundy a notable increase of territory, with results of immense import to France. He gained the County of Burgundy, Flanders, Artois, Rethel, Nevers, and later Brabant; and after a short interval was able to restore peace in Flanders.

The following year Charles married Isabella of Bavaria, and in 1386 and 1387 schemes were discussed and preparations actually made for invading England; and in 1388 an expedition to punish the Duke of Gueldres proved costly and was of little advantage to the monarchy. These failures may have influenced Charles in his practical dismissal of his uncles, Burgundy and Berry. Till 1392 the government was in the charge of the *Marmousets*, several of his father's capable ministers, such as the Constable de Clisson, Jean de Nogent, and Arnaud de Corbie, while Louis of Orleans, the

¹ The close of the Babylonish Captivity in 1378 was followed by the Great Schism in the Papacy, which was not healed till the Council of Constance.

King's brother, had the chief influence at Court. This chance of the establishment of good government in France was, however, wrecked in 1392, when Charles became for a time insane; for the remainder of his life he was never able to direct the affairs of the kingdom. Consequently, the government fell into the hands of the great dukes, who proved incapable of guiding France through a period of much difficulty and anxiety.

The advance of the Turks, who had inflicted a crushing defeat on the Christian army at Nicopolis in 1396, the deposition of the Emperor Wenzel and Richard II at the end of the century, the confusion caused by the continuance of the Papal Schism—all these circumstances called for wise administrators at the head of affairs in France, which, however, found itself at the opening of the fifteenth century in a state of anarchy and confusion owing to the rivalry of the factions of Burgundy and of Orleans. It was obvious that civil war was imminent. Burgundy was supported by the University of Paris and Paris generally, while Orleans represented the feudal party, and was violently anti-English. In 1396 Richard II married Charles's daughter Isabella, and peace between England and France seemed assured. But the fall of Richard and the accession of the House of Lancaster completely changed the situation, and the triumph of Henry of Lancaster was the defeat of the peace party in England and in France. A small French force landed in Wales to help Owen Glendower, but Henry IV by 1407 had firmly established himself on the English throne. In the meantime Philip the Bold had died (1404). He was succeeded by Jean Sans Peur, who in November 1407 brought about the murder of Orleans. Civil war could not now be averted; and while Burgundy's chief strength lay

in the north and east of France, that of the Orleanists, now led by the Count of Armagnac, whose daughter was the wife of the young Duke of Orleans, lay in the west and south. War actually broke out in 1410, and was of great advantage to England, which had no longer to fear a French invasion. In 1411 Henry sided with the Burgundians, but after their victory over the Armagnacs in the battle of St. Cloud in 1412 he supported the latter party, who offered him Aquitaine. During the civil war a butcher named Caboché had headed a rising of the Parisian populace, which continued for two years, his followers keeping the Dauphin under their supervision. At last the *bourgeoisie* of Paris combined to suppress the Cabochian movement, and thus discredited Burgundy, who had to some extent favoured the rising. The Armagnacs were now triumphant, and with the Dauphin at their head they affected to represent the nation in its struggle with England, now ruled by Henry V, with whom Burgundy made a treaty in May 1415. The struggle definitely opened in August 1415, when Henry landed in Normandy. Thus began the second period of the Hundred Years' War, which continued till 1453, in its early phases threatening the disruption of France. The English victory at Agincourt on October 25 was a victory over the Armagnac army, which did not by any means represent the strength of the French nation. Like the battle of Crécy, the battle of Agincourt was the defeat of an insolent feudal party. Till 1422, when both Henry V and Charles VI died, the results of the battle were seen in many startling political changes. Orleans had been captured at Agincourt, and Bernard VII, Count of Armagnac, his father-in-law, assumed the government of Paris. In 1416 Burgundy met Henry V at Calais, and

it is asserted that the substitution of the House of Lancaster for the House of Valois was arranged. After the meeting, while Henry was busy converting Normandy into an English province, Burgundy marched on Paris, which he entered in May 1418. Armagnac and some 5,000 of his followers were murdered, but the Dauphin Charles escaped and headed the Armagnac party in the provinces, making Poitiers the seat of the Government. In January 1419 the English conquest of Normandy was completed by the capture of Rouen, and the whole of the province passed under English rule. Union of all French parties was absolutely necessary, and the Dauphin vainly endeavoured to bring about a reconciliation with Burgundy on July 8, 1419, at Pouilly. But no real settlement could be effected, as the worthy Duke was busy negotiating with Henry V, and had no wish to live at peace with the Armagnacs. The so-called Treaty of Pouilly was not worth the paper on which it was written, as Burgundy carried off the King, and made no attempt to oppose the English. On September 10 a second meeting took place at Montereau-sur-Yonne. There Burgundy was murdered by the companions of the Dauphin, with the natural result that Philip, the young Duke of Burgundy, definitely joined Henry V. On May 21, 1420, the Treaty of Troyes was signed between the English and French kings. Henry V was to be Regent, and on Charles VI's death to be King of France, and he was to marry Catharine, the daughter of Charles. On December 1, in company with the French King, Henry rode into Paris, and the following year the treaty was ratified by the States-General, and accepted by the University.

But the Treaty of Troyes, unlike the Treaty of Brétigny, was the work of a faction in France, and in no sense

binding on the nation. Paris was not France—as Gambetta pointed out in 1871; already the Dauphin was organizing resistance in the south of France; and on March 21, 1421, aided by a Scottish contingent, he won the battle of Beaugé. Henry V at once hurried to France from England, and on March 22, 1422, captured Meaux, driving the Armagnacs southward. On August 21 he died, and a few weeks later Charles VI also died. Henry VI of England was then proclaimed King of France. The worst was now over, and France slowly regained what she had lost since 1415.

Charles VII on his accession was in a curious position, for Henry VI of England, an infant, was, according to the terms of the Treaty of Troyes, King of France. The country, too, was divided between them, Charles ruling at Bourges over the south, west, and central portion of France, while the English domination extended over most of northern France including Paris, being more firmly established in Normandy than elsewhere. But the strength of the English cause lay chiefly in the fact that the Duke of Bedford, the English Regent, was a capable ruler, and skilled in the work of administration. He endeavoured to govern the English possessions in France according to French ideas, and not to attempt any drastic changes in the administration of the conquered provinces. But in a half-conquered country, liable to attacks from the troops of Charles VII, no settlement, except perhaps in Normandy, could be regarded as permanent. For some six years from 1423 to 1429, until the Maid of Orleans came on the scene, the fortunes of the English improved. Charles was in the hands of the Armagnac party, which showed no signs of patriotism, its chief object being to overthrow Burgundy, who since the affair of Montereau was the firm ally of the

English. In the battles of Cravant (1423) and Verneuil (1424) the Armagnacs were defeated, though aided in the latter battle by a strong Scottish contingent. Fortunately for the French cause, the English operations were for a considerable time hampered by Bedford's difficulties in England. Gloucester, the English Regent, by his marriage with Jacqueline of Holland and Hainault, exasperated Philip of Burgundy, whose alliance meant so much for England, and no little time was occupied in settling the difficulty and in preserving the Burgundian friendship.

Consequently it was not till the close of 1428 that an English army, under Lord Salisbury, began the siege of Orleans. Its capture would have reduced Charles VII's holding in France to Languedoc and Dauphiné, and would have secured the English supremacy in central France. The siege of Orleans was, therefore, the decisive event in the reign of the French King. During its progress there spread through France a wave of national feeling which was illustrated and intensified by the appearance at Chinon of Jeanne d'Arc on March 6, 1429. About a fortnight later she was appointed *Chef de Guerre*, and an army placed under her command. She had arrived at an opportune moment; for though Salisbury had been killed, a French force under La Hire had on February 12, 1429, failed, in the battle of the Herrings, to cut off an English convoy from Paris commanded by Sir John Falstaff. This failure led the besieged citizens to negotiate; but luckily Bedford refused to accept their proposals, and till the arrival of Jeanne d'Arc it seemed that the fall of the city was imminent. Her arrival coincided not only with the growth in France of a patriotic determination to defeat the English, but also with the appearance of difficulties in England, and with

[illegible]

English Miles 0 50 100 200 300

English Possessions shaded thus

Burgundian " " " "

Map of France and surrounding regions, showing various provinces, cities, and rivers. The map includes a scale bar at the top left indicating distances in English miles (0 to 300). A legend at the top left identifies 'English Possessions shaded thus' and 'Burgundian' with corresponding hatching patterns. The map shows major cities like Paris, Lyon, Bordeaux, and Bayonne, and rivers like the Rhine, Moselle, and Ebro. The map is divided into numerous regions, many of which are shaded to indicate English or Burgundian possessions.

[illegible]

indications of Burgundy's desire to sever his alliance with Henry VI. On April 28, 1429, Jeanne d'Arc with a small force pushed her way into Orleans; on May 8 the siege was raised; the country south of the Loire was cleared of the English, and Suffolk, who had succeeded Salisbury in command of the troops besieging Orleans, was captured. Talbot and Sir John Falstaff were next defeated at Patay, Talbot being taken prisoner, and Charles was crowned at Rheims on July 17. The expulsion of the English from Paris was now the object of Jeanne. But the attack which she led failed; in May 1430, while leading a sally from Compiègne, she fell into the hands of the Burgundians, and before the end of the year was sold to the English, who, after a most iniquitous trial, burned her at the stake on May 30, 1431. Her career, short as it was, was invaluable to France, for she represented the rising national determination to expel the English. After her appearance, the French soldiers fought as never before, and all attempts to belittle her influence upon the campaign or to cast discredit on her motives and actions have absolutely failed.

Though the war continued for another twenty-one years the eventual triumph of the French was assured, and step by step the English were driven out of France. In December 1435 Philip of Burgundy, who had been wavering in his alliance with England since 1430, signed the Treaty of Arras with the French King. In 1432 the Duchess of Bedford, sister of Philip of Burgundy, had died; and shortly afterwards Bedford, by marrying Jacquetta of Luxemburg, had deeply irritated Philip, whose vassal she was. Moreover, the Emperor Sigismund and Frederick, Duke of Austria, had allied themselves with the French King, thus creating in Philip's mind a fear of an attack from Germany. Finally,

the death of Bedford on September 14, 1435, decided him to accept the favourable terms offered by Charles. He received the 'Somme towns' of which we hear so much in the reign of Louis XI, and other additions to the Duchy of Burgundy. During Charles's reign the Duke was free from the payment of all taxes, and in fact became practically independent. It was provided, however, that on payment of 400,000 crowns the 'Somme towns' were to be restored to the King.

France was now united, and the work of rehabilitation, together with the expulsion of the English, proceeded apace. In April 1436 Richemont occupied Paris, which was entered by the King on November 12, 1437. During the following seven years the war slackened, both sides being exhausted, the French King having, moreover, to face the civil war, known as the Praguerie, which broke out in 1440. The conspirators, among whom were the Dauphin (afterwards Louis XI) and the Duke of Bourbon, took advantage of the King's frequent residence in his castles on the Loire, and proposed to set up an oligarchy. The immediate cause of this conspiracy was the action of the States-General, which had met at Orleans the previous year and had strengthened the royal power in various ways. The *taille* (property tax) was henceforward to be paid direct to the King for defraying the military expenses, while by the *Ordonnance de la Gendarmerie* a permanent military force was established to enforce the law, and to suppress brigandage and robbery. No wonder that the decadent feudalism, which had brought such disasters to France at Agincourt and Verneuil, was alarmed at the prospect of a monarchy strong in the control of the purse, and in possession of a permanent military force. The foundations of a despotism in France were securely laid.

France was united, the Praguerie was suppressed, and the Dauphin Louis was in July 1440 sent to reside in Dauphiné. But the country was terribly exhausted: its condition was similar to that of 1360-8. Gradually, after the Peace of Arras, order was slowly restored, and the Truce of Tours, which was arranged in May 1444, enabled the Government to carry on the absolutely necessary work of recuperation. The period between the Peace of Arras and the Truce of Tours was important in the history of Europe as well as in that of France. It saw the meeting of the Council of Basel (1431-49), followed by the issue by Charles of the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges (1438), which emphasized the independence of the Gallican Church, thus continuing the policy initiated by Philip the Fair. France itself witnessed the re-establishment of order, the improvement in the currency, and the suppression of brigandage. During those years Charles was fortunate in numbering among his advisers Richemont, who as Constable had since 1428 steadily increased his military reputation, Charles of Anjou, Duke of Maine (the Queen's brother), and his Queen.

The conclusion of the Treaty of Tours in 1444 synchronizes with a remarkable change in the character of the French King. Henceforward, he showed an activity and energy which had excellent results for France. The army was completely reformed in 1445, and well-organized cavalry regiments were raised; while in 1448 and 1449 further additions to the army were made. The practice of relying mainly on mercenaries and on a disorderly feudal force was abandoned; and the Crown, provided with a standing army, was enabled to lay the foundations of that absolute monarchy which Louis XI formally established.

In July 1449 the truce with England ended, and in

eleven months the French had regained Normandy, defeating the English at Formigny in April 1450. In Guienne the difficulties with which the French had to contend were greater, for the English occupation of that part of France dated from the twelfth century. In October 1452 Talbot, Earl of Shrewsbury, arrived at Bordeaux and found the Gascon population ready to defend themselves against the French. But on July 17, 1453, he was defeated and killed in the battle of Châtillon, Bordeaux fell again into the hands of the French in October, and by the end of the year Calais, Guines, and Havre were the only possessions held by Henry VI in France.

During the years following the English failure to capture Orleans the work of internal reform had gradually proceeded, and after the Treaty of Tours the results were clearly apparent. Charles had wisely employed a number of men of the middle class, of whom one of the most celebrated was Jacques Cœur, a merchant, who devoted himself to the care of the finances. Such men sat with Richemont and Dunois in the royal council, which, like the *Curia Regis* of Henry I of England, was mainly composed of business-like men of humble origin. Aided by these men, and perhaps partly inspired by his favourite, Agnes Sorel, Charles, in spite of 'the fundamental baseness of his character', found himself able to establish the royal authority on a firm foundation, even without the aid of the States-General, which at this period in the history of France was unequal to the task for which it apparently was intended, of contributing to the formation of a powerful kingdom. Even the provincial assemblies, which at an earlier period had shown activity, were before the end of the reign reduced to impotence.

At the time of his death in 1461 Charles left France

a monarchy unhampered by a constitution, such as existed in England. Would his son Louis continue his policy? Louis was an unknown factor. After his banishment to Dauphiné in 1440 Louis had been reconciled to Charles only to enter into another conspiracy in 1446. He was again banished to Dauphiné, and while there married Charlotte, daughter of the Duke of Savoy. In 1456, in order to escape from the control of his father, he fled to the Court of Philip of Burgundy.

One other matter of anxiety was the immense power wielded by the Burgundian Duke, who had refused to allow Charles to redeem the Somme towns, in accordance with the Treaty of Arras. The history of the later years of the Burgundian dukes belongs to the reign of Louis XI, and fully justified the fears of Charles VII.

Louis XI was the ablest of the Valois kings, as a comparison between the condition of France at his accession in 1461 and at his death in 1483 will prove. The work of reorganizing a country after a long period of warfare is obviously difficult. Charles V in the previous century had shown no little ability in the manner in which he recovered for France most of her lost territory. Louis XI had a still more difficult task; for not only was the country suffering from the long war with England, but a condition of things somewhat resembling the Wars of the Roses existed in France during the early years of his reign, and for fourteen years his attention could never be diverted from the movements of Charles the Bold of Burgundy.

Accompanied by Philip, Duke of Burgundy, he was crowned at Rheims and then proceeded to Paris. The ensuing four years saw his throne in considerable danger. On all sides he encountered opposition, which was only to be

expected when it is remembered that on his accession he was supported by no party, and that the country was still burdened and exhausted by the effects of many years of war. The populace of Paris, which had given him a warm welcome, had, like the majority of his subjects, expected that all taxes would be abolished. His dismissal of his father's councillors added to his difficulties, for it was at once made evident that Louis intended to rule as well as to reign. It has been said that in him you find the 'restless eagerness of a revolutionary leader'. In some respects he resembled the Emperor Joseph II, who in the years just preceding the French Revolution attempted 'to attain all ends at once'. Throughout his reign Louis was utterly reckless of giving offence when in prosperity, but when once entangled in a dangerous position no man could show greater skill in extricating himself.

On his accession he had three chief aims: first, to weaken or to destroy the power of the feudal nobility; secondly, to recover the Somme towns from the Duke of Burgundy; and, thirdly, to win the support of the Papacy by abolishing the Pragmatic Sanction. In 1461 that abolition was carried out, though Louis was careful throughout his reign to admit or repel the Papal pretensions as it suited him at the time. He may have hoped to secure the Papal support for John of Calabria's pretensions to the crown of Naples; at any rate, the repeal of the Pragmatic Sanction destroyed the influence of the nobles in the election of bishops and in the collation of benefices. Louis' activity was manifested in 1462, when he visited the southern provinces, confirming and enlarging the charters of towns, especially those of Bordeaux—so lately ruled by the English kings. While in the south he took advantage of a civil war in Catalonia to acquire Roussillon. A revolt, however, followed; and it was

not till 1463 that the Convention of Bayonne was concluded between Henry IV of Castile and Louis, by which the latter received the somewhat precarious possession of Roussillon.

Though the extension of his dominions to the Pyrenees was earnestly desired by Louis, the recovery of the Somme towns (Péronne, Roye, Montdidier, St. Quentin, Amiens, Corbie being the chief) was the main object of his earlier policy, Louis aiming naturally at possessing a defensible frontier against Burgundy and England. These towns had by the Treaty of Arras been ceded to the Duke of Burgundy, who engaged to restore them on receipt of 400,000 crowns. In 1463 Louis with infinite difficulty collected the required sum and regained the towns. But the danger from Burgundy, by the end of the year 1464, had sensibly increased. The French party in that Court had fallen, and Charles, then Count of Charolais, had been reconciled to his father and was supreme. Louis was isolated, and though he endeavoured to strengthen himself by foreign alliances, and early in 1465 by appealing to the deputies of the northern towns at Rouen, and shortly afterwards by summoning a meeting of the notables at Tours, he was unable to prevent the attack on him by the League of Public Weal.

That League had been formed in Paris in December 1464. It was headed by the Duke of Berry, and included several of the late King's ministers, who had appealed to the Duke of Burgundy, their ostensible grounds of complaint being the heavy taxation, the illegal exactions, and 'the unworthiness of the Government'.

Louis, scenting danger, at once began to collect armed forces and to arrange for the defence of Paris, and for the overthrow of the army under the Dukes of Brittany and Berry before the arrival of the Burgundians under Charo-

lais. The treachery of several leading nobles somewhat upset the royal plans, and Charolais with a force of about 10,000 men reached Paris in June. Meanwhile Louis had also approached the capital from the south with a force of 12,000 men composed chiefly of cavalry, and on July 16 the indecisive battle of Montl'héri was fought. The news of frequent instances of treachery in various parts of the country and of the loss of Normandy in September decided Louis to agree to the Treaty of Conflans (or St. Maur) in October. The concessions made by the King were so considerable that it is quite evident his immediate object was to dissolve the hostile confederacy at any cost. He yielded the towns on the Somme to Charolais; the Dukes of Brittany and Bourbon obtained what they demanded, the latter receiving the government of Guienne; Saint-Pol, Nemours, Dunois, Dammartin, and other traitors were amply rewarded. John of Calabria, the brother of Queen Margaret of England and an honest man, obtained, among other concessions, various towns on the frontier of Lorraine.

The ultimate victory was, however, assured to Louis owing to the fact that the French nobles, like the barons in the reign of Stephen of England, merely desired to remain petty sovereigns, aiming at independence and the formation of isolated despotisms. They were thus attempting to stem the advancing tide of nationality and unity which had been stimulated by the long wars with England. Further, among the late supporters of the French barons were many soldiers and lawyers who had no particular sympathy with the views of those who wished to divide France into a number of independent principalities. Finally, the majority of the gentry and middle classes, whose neutrality had so aided the League, now realized what the intentions of Charolais and

his confederates were—what the ‘public weal’ meant—and before many months were over showed clearly that they had no sympathy with the dismemberment of the monarchy.

No sooner had the confederation separated than Louis began to act. He had conciliated Bourbon, Saint-Pol, and John of Calabria, and taking advantage of the revolt of Liège, the suppression of which occupied Charolais till the end of the year 1465, when the Liégeois had to consent to the Piteous Peace, he recovered Normandy, the most valuable and important province in the kingdom. Louis had thus made a most profitable use of the diversion caused by the revolt of Liège.

During the following three years Louis endeavoured to strengthen his position in various ways. In 1466 he came to an agreement with Warwick, the envoy of the English nobles who opposed the Burgundian policy of their King; but in June 1467 Philip the Good died, and Charles the Bold was able to develop his ambitious schemes, in the same year punishing the people of Liège for a fresh rebellion, and in 1468 marrying Elizabeth of York and forming a close alliance with her brother Edward IV. This alliance was a blow to Louis’ diplomacy. To counteract its effect (after quelling a rebellion in Brittany in September 1468) the French King resolved to go to Péronne and to negotiate with Charles in person. The risk was great, but Louis had an exalted opinion of his own diplomatic skill, and, in spite of the warnings of Dammartin, he was satisfied with Charles’s assurance of a safe-conduct. Early in October he found himself in the castle of Péronne.

Louis’ chief object was to induce the Duke to abandon his alliances with England and Brittany. While the negotiations were in progress another rising took place in Liège, and it was

reported that Louis' agents had led the mob. For a time Louis' fate hung in the balance, but after an anxious interval Charles decided to insist upon Louis' agreeing to execute the Treaty of Conflans, to surrender all his rights to Picardy, and to give his brother, Charles of France, Champagne and Brie. Louis was also compelled to be present at the capture of Liège, according to his agreement with Charles, and showed great personal courage. For a time after his return to France Louis lived in Touraine, as he felt acutely his own folly in trusting himself to the Duke of Burgundy. He soon, however, resumed his duties, and persuaded his brother Charles, with whom he was reconciled, to accept Guienne instead of Champagne and Brie.

During the next three years, till the close of 1472, Louis had an anxious time. By his efforts Warwick, who had fled to him from England, was reconciled to Queen Margaret, and in 1470 they landed in England, and restored Henry VI—Edward IV having fled to Charles the Bold's dominions. Louis' policy had succeeded, and he now attacked Burgundy, winning some successes. Charles, finding himself in a difficult position, asked and obtained (April 1471) a truce for three months, Louis retaining Amiens and St. Quentin. Ten days later the victory of Edward IV at Barnet, followed on May 4 by that at Tewkesbury, overthrew the Houses of Neville and Lancaster. A new situation was thus created for Louis, and it called for careful handling. The death of Charles, Duke of Guienne, in 1472 was, however, a piece of good fortune, for Louis at once took possession of the province. Charles the Bold, furious at the blow to his plans caused by the Duke's death, at once invaded France, committing atrocities at Nesle and Roye. Beauvais, however, held out successfully, and Charles, having continued his work

of devastation as far as Rouen, found himself compelled to retreat.

It was quite evident that the situation in France was very different from what it was at the time of the League of Public Weal. The towns, which then had been neutral, now defended themselves bravely against the Burgundians. Moreover, about this time Charles's Chamberlain, Philippe de Commines, weary of 'his capricious and overbearing master', fled by night and entered into the service of Louis XI. That event, Louis' peace with Brittany in November 1472, and the lasting peace with Charles the Bold in the same month, bring to a close the first period in Louis' reign. He had triumphed over many difficulties and had safely emerged from various risky situations. The second period of his reign is full of interesting and startling developments, and closes with the death of Charles the Bold in 1477. Till that event took place Charles, in conjunction with the French princes, was aiming at the overthrow of the supremacy of the Crown, at the creation of a bastard feudalism in its place, and at the establishment of his domination over Picardy and Champagne. He had failed to carry out these aims, and he now embarked upon a more ambitious policy, his object being, in the words of the late Professor Freeman, 'not to gain a paramount influence within the kingdom of France, not to weaken the French monarchy in the character of one of its vassals, but to throw it into the shade, to dismember, perhaps to conquer it, in the character of a foreign sovereign'.¹ These years are of unusual interest in European history and were of paramount importance to France and the Empire. For had Charles been successful in setting up a middle kingdom, the effects would have been far-reaching. He

¹ Freeman, *Select Essays* : Charles the Bold.

himself was confident of his ability to form an independent and comparatively compact middle kingdom, and having effected this object to raise himself to the Imperial throne. Until his failure to carry out these projects, and his death, the policy of Louis was one of constant watchfulness. 'It seemed to some', writes Commynes, 'that the King ought not to have prolonged the truce, nor to have suffered the Duke's presumption to wax so great.... There were others [among whom was probably Commynes himself] who understood this matter better, and whose knowledge was greater, because they had been on the spot. These advisers urged him to accept the truce without much misgiving and to allow the Duke to dash himself against those German countries, whose might and power is such as to be wellnigh incredible.... It was certain that all his resources would be spent and utterly wasted against the great size and strength of Germany.'

Charles, after the conclusion of 'the lasting truce' with Louis, lost no time in endeavouring to carry out his vast schemes, which, if successful, would, it is said, have resulted 'in the oppression of Germany, the disruption of the French monarchy, the subjection of Switzerland and Savoy'. Already in 1469 he had bought, subject to certain conditions, the Alsatian dominions of Duke Sigismund of Austria, cousin of the Emperor Frederick III, thus securing a position on both sides of the Upper Rhine; in 1473 he secured Guelders and Zutphen, and seizing and imprisoning René, Duke of Lorraine, made preparations to annex his duchy. But his schemes in their entirety could not be carried out without the acquiescence of the Emperor, with whom a meeting took place at Trier. Charles had already found it necessary to release René of Lorraine (securing, however, four fortresses), as Louis XI was ready to contest by force of

arms the permanent occupation of Lorraine by the Burgundians, and moreover held a nephew of the Emperor in custody as a hostage for the safety of René.

Gradually the Emperor became not only suspicious of Charles, but also fearful for his own safety. Might not he, too, have to undergo a Péronne experience? So, after a somewhat unsatisfactory interview with Charles, the Emperor, on the night following, 'dropped quietly and swiftly down the Moselle in a boat which had been prepared to receive him'. Charles, on discovering that he was 'the laughing-stock of Europe' and that his Imperial plans were for the time frustrated, proceeded through Lorraine to Alsace, where the rule of his agent, Peter of Hagenbach, had roused discontent bordering on open rebellion. The seriousness of the situation was becoming daily more apparent, especially as the Swiss League, which consisted of eight cantons, was showing suspicions of Charles, and Berne, Zurich, and Lucerne began to take the lead in opposing his designs. In 1474 the Alsatians drove out the Burgundians and executed Hagenbach; and in October the Swiss League made a treaty with Louis, engaging to assist him with an armed force and to receive large sums of money from him. On December 20 the League declared war upon Charles, who, engaged in besieging Neuss, could now only rely upon his alliance with Edward IV, concluded on July 25, which provided for an English invasion of France.

Till the close of the following year (1475) the situation was perplexing even to the most acute observers. In that year events took place which indicated that a crisis in the history of France and Burgundy was at hand. The arrival of some 80,000 Imperial troops, under the Margrave Albert of Brandenburg, in the neighbourhood of Neuss led Charles to

conclude a truce with the Emperor and, in June, to raise the siege, which had lasted eleven months. His army was exhausted and his treasury empty, and he was being attacked by the Swiss, by the Duke of Lorraine, and by Louis. The latter, having failed to induce him to renew the truce which expired on May 1, burned Roye, Montdidier, and Corbie, and devastated most of Artois. Edward IV, however, landed in France in the summer, and Charles met him at Calais on July 12. Everything depended upon a friendly understanding between Edward and Charles, and upon the co-operation of their forces.

The first event which indicated to Edward IV the unsatisfactory character of the situation was the refusal of Saint-Pol to admit, according to promise, the English into St. Quentin; the second was the sudden departure of Charles from the English camp. The season was advancing and the English forces, disappointed at the absence of their allies, found themselves in a strange country without any fixed plan of campaign. Louis quickly realized the situation, and acted with acuteness and celerity. Negotiations were opened with Edward, preliminaries of peace which included the payment by Louis of vast sums of money to Edward, a marriage alliance—a daughter of Edward to marry the Dauphin—the release of Queen Margaret, and trade facilities between the two countries were rapidly arranged. The two kings met at Picquigny on the Somme on August 29, and Edward and his army slowly returned to England.

The Peace of Picquigny was a tribute to Louis' diplomatic skill, and Charles discovered to his dismay that it was to last for seven years. Weakened by his efforts at Neuss, faced by the refusal of the Estates of Flanders to grant him men or money, and deserted by the English King, Charles reluc-

tantly agreed to a peace for nine years with Louis, on November 13. The French King consented not only to abandon his alliance with the Emperor and Sigismund of Austria, but also not to aid the Swiss in any attempt that they might make to conquer Alsace. Charles promised to arrange for Saint-Pol's punishment for high treason either at his (Charles's) hands or at those of the King. While Charles was besieging Nancy in November, Saint-Pol was handed over to Louis, by whom he was executed without delay. Meanwhile Charles had taken Nancy, which, he declared, should be the capital of his realm. The annexation of Lorraine had been fairly easily accomplished, and Charles, impatient of delay, though his army required rest, determined to attack the Swiss. He was fully cognizant of the seriousness of the task before him, for the Swiss were already well known to be the hardiest and bravest soldiers in Europe. It is surmised that he intended, after inflicting a defeat on his opponents, to march into Italy.

The crisis in his career had, however, arrived. Louis XI, as if he already anticipated the results of the coming campaigns, arrived at Lyons with a strong force. His prescience was justified, for on March 3, 1476, the news was brought that on the previous day Charles had been defeated by the Swiss in the battle of Granson.¹ Undeterred by this check to his projects, Charles collected a powerful force which included 3,000 English archers, and besieged Morat. The confederate forces hastily assembled, and on June 23 the famous battle of Morat was fought. After a long and terrible struggle Charles was defeated and fled from the field of battle. Disaster

¹ Does the fact that Charles had with him jewellery and plate indicate an intention of proceeding to Italy, perhaps to receive from the Pope the title of King of the Romans?

followed disaster. The subjects of Charles refused to assist him in carrying on an offensive war. In October 1476 René, Duke of Lorraine, besieged Nancy, which after a brave defence capitulated. At the beginning of the year 1477 René was in Lorraine with a considerable army, advancing to relieve Nancy, which, defended by a small garrison to which he had committed its safety, had held out for several weeks. In spite of warnings Charles with an inferior force persisted in giving battle; on January 2, 1477, he was defeated in the battle of Nancy, and two days later was found dead in a brook.

The crisis which had been impending during the last few years was now ended. But Louis' anxiety, even though Charles's fall had been foreseen by many, had been fully justified. In spite of his defeat and losses at Granson Charles might easily have been victorious at Morat, 'for the struggle', we are told, 'was long and bloody, and the event doubtful till the flank of the Duke's army was turned by a division of the enemy'. In the event of a victory, Charles would undoubtedly have persevered in his attempt to form a middle kingdom. As it was, the idea of a middle kingdom died with him, and so far his death marks an epoch in European history. The policy of Charles V in setting up the House of Burgundy was a blunder not to be repeated.

For Louis the death of Charles the Bold raised most important questions. Charles's daughter and Louis' goddaughter, Mary of Burgundy, now ruled over Flanders and the other possessions of his House. Louis had a problem before him somewhat similar to that which confronted Fleury in 1740. The latter had to decide whether his attitude towards Maria Theresa should be a policy of friendship. Louis was faced with a similar problem. Was he to suggest a marriage between Mary and the Dauphin, or some French prince such

as the Count of Angoulême? Or was he to break the existing truce and, taking advantage of the weakness of the Princess, to annex several of the Burgundian possessions? Anticipating the decision of Fleury, he resolved to adopt a violent and ingenious policy. Though he opened negotiations for Mary's marriage he lost no time in occupying the Burgundies (the Duchy and the County), and at the same time instigated Ghent and other towns to refuse the payment of taxes, and to demand the restoration of liberties which had been suppressed by Charles the Bold. At first Mary, guided by Humbercourt and Hugonot, the two 'French' ministers in her Council, practically agreed to Louis' demands of territory; but no sooner had the Estates of Flanders and Brabant heard from Louis of these concessions than a violent anti-French movement took place in Ghent, and the two ministers were executed.

Louis had made a serious blunder in divulging Mary's proposals, and, what was equally serious, the inhabitants of the two Burgundies, maddened by the rapacity of the King's agents, rose in violent rebellion. The French garrisons in Franche-Comté (the County of Burgundy), which owed allegiance to the Empire, were driven out; Craon, Louis' general, was defeated on March 19, 1477, at Vesoul, and was replaced by Charles d'Amboise; and Arras, which had been seized by Louis, revolted. Louis himself, who was wounded, led the attack on Arras, took it, decimated the inhabitants, renamed the town 'Franchise', and imported into it settlers from Languedoc and other parts of France. The whole of Artois except St. Omer now passed into Louis' hands, and Hainault was invaded. The war developed in intensity, and Mary's marriage to Maximilian of Austria on August 18 ended all Louis' hopes of a marriage alliance between the

heiress of Burgundy and a French prince. In September a truce was made which continued till 1479, and in the meantime Louis endeavoured in various ways to strengthen his position.

Having succeeded in securing a large portion of the Burgundian inheritance, Louis took precautions to assure himself of the neutrality of Brittany, England, and the Empire, and in 1478 entered upon a new campaign in the Netherlands, capturing Condé (shortly afterwards evacuating it), and agreeing to a truce in October. The same month he succeeded in concluding a treaty with Ferdinand and Isabella, who in January 1479 united by their marriage the crowns of Castile and Aragon, thus laying the foundations of the great Spanish monarchy. In that year Louis' daughter, Madeleine, became Regent of Navarre, and her daughter, Catherine, married Jean d'Albret, under whose rule French influence became paramount. The campaign of 1479 was opened by the rupture of the existing truce by the Burgundians, who were, however, in July forced to submit, Dôle being captured and razed to the ground. Simultaneously with the rising in Burgundy Maximilian had begun operations in the north and was besieging Thérouanne. Crèvecœur, the successor of Dammartin, at once engaged the enemy, and the notable battle of Thérouanne took place. The battle was indecisive, but Maximilian raised the siege, and for want of money was unable to take the offensive in 1480, while Louis' fleet dealt a heavy blow at the trade of the Low Countries.

As usual, Louis, fearful of English intervention supported by Brittany, was anxious to treat. Commynes noticed in 1480 how aged Louis had become, and in 1481 he had a slight stroke of apoplexy. Maximilian, in August 1480, had agreed to a truce for seven months, which he later prolonged for

a year. Before he died Louis, who by his clever Pyrenean policy had already acquired Roussillon and Cerdagne, united to the crown in 1481 the domains of the House of Anjou as well as Bar and Provence. In March of the following year Mary of Burgundy died, leaving two children, Philip and Margaret; and on December 23, by the Treaty of Arras, it was arranged that Margaret should be betrothed to the Dauphin, bringing with her Artois and Franche-Comté as a dowry, and on her arrival in France she was placed under the care of the Lord and Lady of Beaujeu (Louis' daughter).¹

In its main features Louis' policy is similar to that pursued by Ferdinand and Isabella of Spain, by Edward IV, and by Henry VII of England. All these monarchs treated representative assemblies, which they rarely summoned, with severity. Before the end of the century, owing to their policy, despotisms, which varied in character but which were despotisms, were established in these countries, all attempts to establish feudal oligarchies having for ever failed. In France at the time of Louis' death 'all was prepared for the new phase of national life of which the invasion of Italy by Charles VIII was the signal'.² Louis, however, had carefully refused to yield to the temptation of interfering actively in Italian politics, and so was able to leave behind him vast resources and a strong consolidated kingdom.

Louis was indeed the ablest king of the Valois line. At the time of his death he had crushed the 'Lords of the Lilies' and all attempts to set up a feudal oligarchy. He had baffled

¹ Before he embarked on the invasion of Italy Charles VIII sent Margaret back to Maximilian, restoring Artois and Franche-Comté (Treaty of Senlis, May 1493), having already (by the Treaty of Barcelona, January 1493) ceded Roussillon and Cerdagne to Spain.

² P. F. Willert, *The Reign of Louis XI*, p. 299 (Rivingtons: 1876).

the powerful Duke of Burgundy, and the danger to France of the establishment of a middle kingdom had been removed. The years which he had to devote to watching every movement of Charles the Bold had deprived him of the time required for carrying out all his proposed projects for the benefit of France. Yet much had been done, as his numerous ordinances for the regulation and encouragement of trade testify. 'Foreign merchants were', we are told, 'encouraged to frequent the great fairs of Champagne; and new fairs with similar privileges and equal freedom of trade were established at Arras, Caen, Lyons, Bayonne, and other places.'¹

His treaty with the Hanseatic League, made in 1464 and enlarged in 1473 and again later, was intended to encourage French maritime enterprise. On Louis' accession no navy existed, but within ten years, as the result of this treaty and of his navigation laws, a fleet of sixty ships had been constructed which, after the acquisition of Provence, checked the Barbary States pirates and gave a great impulse to French trade in the Levant. He also encouraged the manufacture of silk in the southern counties, causing a vast number of mulberry trees to be planted. Learning was also definitely encouraged; in 1469 and 1471 printing presses were set up in the Sorbonne, and others were subsequently established at Lyons, Caen, and Angers. Moreover, a warm welcome was given to Greek refugees from Constantinople; the old-fashioned disputations of the schools were treated with contempt; the University of Paris itself, the home of orthodoxy, the exponent of the view that kings might be deposed if they neglected their duties, and the enemy of the *Parlement* of Paris, was forced to accept the regulations ordained by Louis himself.

¹ Willert, *The Reign of Louis XI.*

Louis' unpopularity during his later years is not surprising; for in face of the heavy taxation his subjects soon forgot that, like Henry II of England, he had saved his country from a feudal supremacy, which implied anarchy and civil war. His military reforms, too, engendered great discontent. Enormous sums were spent on armaments, and in place of the free archers he established a force of 25,000 mercenaries composed in great part of Italians, Scots, Germans, and Swiss, whose lack of discipline in peace time rendered them very unpopular. The increased taxation to which France was subjected during his reign called forth, as has been already said, many complaints—not that Louis' personal expenditure was other than most moderate, but his system of filling foreign courts with his agents proved most expensive. The years 1481 and 1482 were years of great scarcity, almost amounting to famine.

Like many kings during the Middle Ages Louis, who was personally courageous, was a keen hunter and often devoted whole days to sport. He was, it is true, very superstitious, and as his end drew near endeavoured to prolong his life by means of relics and appeals to St. Francis of Paola, a noted devotee of the time. On August 24, 1483, he had a third paralytic seizure, and during the last few days of his life showed dignity worthy of a great king. He died in the gloomy castle of Plessis-lès-Tours on August 30, 1483. Though he is often charged with many acts of tyranny, cruelty, and treachery, 'there is no instance in his life of aimless and wanton cruelty'. There is no reason for disputing the judgement expressed by Commynes after his death: 'He was more wise, more liberal, and more virtuous in all things than any contemporary sovereign.'

*The Renaissance in France and the Beginning
of Franco-German Hostility, 1483-1558*

As Charles VIII was only thirteen years old when in 1483 he succeeded Louis XI as King of France, the government of the country was at first carried on by his sister, Anne of Beaujeu. In January 1484 the States-General met at Tours, discussed public grievances, and urged that it should be called together every two years. The Duke of Orleans (afterwards Louis XII), the first prince of the blood, was placed at the head of the Council of State, and Anne of Beaujeu was appointed guardian of the King. In 1488 the Duke of Brittany died, leaving the Duchy to his daughter Anne, who was then in her thirteenth year. Anne of Brittany was no ordinary woman. Small and delicate, she had a dignified carriage, and was firm and resolute. Determined to maintain her independence, she made alliances with England and Spain and arranged to marry Maximilian. But, influenced by Anne of Beaujeu, she gave up Maximilian, and in December 1491, being about seventeen years old, consented to marry Charles VIII. Brittany was thus incorporated with the French kingdom, and a barrier was set up against invasion from England. Charles had even at this early period in his reign determined to invade Italy and conquer Naples.

No one who lived at the close of the fifteenth century could have realized that the accession of Charles VIII would be the prelude to a struggle between France and

Germany which has with intervals continued till the present day. Nor could it be realized how important were to be to France the results of the discovery of America, leading to the occupation of Canada and the famous struggle with England for its possession which only ended in favour of the latter in 1763. Moreover, no Frenchmen could at that time have anticipated how great would be the effect upon French thought and upon French architecture of the contact with the Italian Renaissance. The invasion of Italy by the French King in 1494 marks indeed the beginning of modern times.

His expedition to Italy did not come as a surprise to the rulers of the various Italian states. The growth of France had long been realized by them ; and their own weakness was as well known to them as it was to their powerful neighbours. That weakness had become very apparent after the death of Lorenzo de' Medici in 1492. The position of Alfonso, King of Naples, owing to the tyrannical character of his rule, was unstable ; while that of Ludovico il Moro, the ruler of the rich state of Milan, might be threatened at any time by the claims of the Duke of Orleans. Moreover, Gian Galeazzo, the deposed Duke of Milan, had married the granddaughter of the King of Naples, and Ludovico feared that a coalition headed by Alfonso of Naples might at any moment attack him. The powerful state of Venice with its ample resources was hostile both to Naples and to Milan, and on Charles VIII's accession sent an embassy to France proposing the conquest of both these states. That the accession of Charles VIII to the throne of France was likely to lead to French intervention in Italy was first recognized by Ludovico, who in 1492 renewed the alliance with France which had been made by his father, Francesco

Sforza. He thus diverted the attention of the French King from Milan to Naples, upon which Charles VIII had vague claims. Moreover, a number of the oppressed Neapolitan barons who had fled to France were continually urging the French King to conquer Naples and Sicily, the crown of which carried with it that of Jerusalem. An attack upon the kingdom of the Two Sicilies would thus partake of the nature of a crusade. Before a French expedition could set out for Italy it was necessary to safeguard France from any possible attacks by her neighbours. The Treaty of Étapes in November 1492, that of Barcelona in January 1493, and that of Senlis in May 1493 secured France from any attacks by Henry VII, Ferdinand of Aragon, and the Emperor Maximilian. Charles, who had assumed the title of King of Sicily and Jerusalem, was thus able to continue the warlike preparations which he had begun in 1492; in May 1494 French troops entered Italy, and in August a French fleet defeated that of Naples.

In the autumn Charles himself crossed the Alps, and on November 17 entered Florence, which had risen against its ruler Piero de' Medici, who had fled. Charles then advanced to Rome. Before he entered Naples, on February 22, 1495, Alfonso had resigned in favour of his son Ferrantino, who, on Charles's approach, fled to Ischia.

It was soon evident that all idea of a crusade must be put aside. The hostility of Ferdinand of Aragon, whose fleet was guarding Sicily, was almost avowed. The rapid success which attended Charles VIII's expedition aroused general alarm in Europe, and especially in Italy. Ferdinand and Maximilian were no less perturbed than was Alexander VI, who had always disliked the arrival of the French in Italy. A league of Italian Powers was rapidly

formed, in which Venice took a leading part. Leaving troops in Naples, which were soon forced to yield to a Spanish force, Charles set out for France on May 21, 1495. After a battle at Fornovo with the army of the league (July 5), he returned to France, where in April 1499 he died, leaving no son.

The history of the gradual expulsion of the French from Naples and the south of Italy is given in picturesque language by Guillaume de Villeneuve, 'Chevalier Conseiller et Maistre d'ostel du roy de France, de Secille, et de Jerusalem, Charles VIII de ce nom', who after many adventures was released from captivity in South Italy and arrived at Lyons in the autumn of 1496. There he had an interview with Charles VIII, who, in consideration for his service, made him master of the household. Meanwhile, Montpensier had in July capitulated at Atella, and by the end of the year all was lost to France. The consequences to Italy, though for the moment not so apparent, were in reality more serious, because its weakness stood revealed, and till 1860 that country was frequently the battlefield of the Great Powers of Europe, being to a large extent under Spain and the iron heel of Austria.

The Italian expedition, though a failure as far as France was concerned, marked an epoch in French history. Attracted by the visible results in Italy of the Renaissance movement, Charles returned to France with pictures and books, and before long Italian architects were in France, where in the following reigns they made themselves famous by the erection of châteaux, many of which exist to the present day.

Louis XII, the cousin of the late King, was known before his accession as Louis of Orleans. His accession reunited

the fief of Orleans to the crown. He divorced his wife Jeanne, daughter of Louis XI, and married Anne of Brittany to keep her lands united to the French Crown. Urged by Caesar Borgia, who brought the dispensation from Rome, and George of Amboise, Archbishop of Rouen, he determined to assert the rights of his family in Italy. His grandfather, Louis of Orleans, had married in 1389 Valentina Visconti, daughter of the Duke of Milan. As the grandson of Valentina, Louis now claimed not only the Duchy, but at the same time the kingdom of Naples and Sicily. Allied with Venice, Louis had little difficulty in conquering the Milanese. On October 6, 1499, he entered Milan, Ludovico having fled to the Tyrol. The French rule, however, on account of the heaviness of the imposts and the unpopularity of Trivulzio, a Milanese exile in the service of France, soon became unbearable. In January 1500, hearing of the approach of Ludovico at the head of some Swiss and Burgundian troops, Trivulzio left Milan, which on February 5 was occupied by its former ruler. But in March a French army under La Trémouille invaded the Milanese, Ludovico's army abandoned him, and he was captured on April 10, and sent a prisoner to France, where he died.

The French predominance in northern Italy was now unquestioned, and it remained to establish a similar predominance over the centre and to some extent over the south of Italy.

That predominance was rapidly secured in Tuscany and in the Papal States; and in November 1500 the Treaty of Granada was made with Ferdinand of Aragon, providing for the partition of the kingdom of Naples. Several important matters connected with the share allotted to each

monarch had not been settled in the treaty. Disputes arose, war ensued, the French suffered an overwhelming defeat on the Garigliano on December 27, 1503, and Louis' share of the kingdom of Naples was lost. In October 1505, by an arrangement with Ferdinand, Louis agreed to give up his right in the kingdom of Naples to his relative Germaine de Foix on her marriage with Ferdinand of Aragon.

Meanwhile, to secure still further himself in Milan, Louis in September 1504 signed the three Treaties of Blois with Philip, the son of Maximilian. Among the conditions it was settled that the Princess Claude was to marry Philip's son Charles (afterwards the Emperor Charles V). But in 1505, in consequence of the opposition of the States-General at Tours to the proposed marriage, Louis tore up the Treaties of Blois, and settled that Claude should marry his heir, Francis of Angoulême.

Troubles in Genoa, where the French governor had made himself unpopular, forced Louis in the spring of 1507 to enter upon a campaign to secure the submission of the Genoese. The campaign was short and successful, and on April 26 the city surrendered. Louis' rapid success disturbed all Italy, and more especially Pope Julius II. The alarm was increased by the Treaty of Savona in June 1507, which marked the reconciliation of Louis and Ferdinand of Aragon. But Louis was ingenious enough to secure the support of the Pope for his next Italian project, which was the conquest of the mainland territories of Venice.

In 1507 Louis entered upon a war with Venice, and in the following year the famous League of Cambrai for the partition of the Venetian lands in Italy was signed by George of Amboise and Margaret of Austria. In its

shamelessness it resembled the equally famous partitions of Poland in the eighteenth century and the German invasion of Belgium in August 1914. Julius II, Maximilian, Ferdinand of Aragon, and Louis XII were to share the spoils. Louis' victory at Agnadello on May 14, 1509, was followed by his advance to within sight of Venice.

But the league soon broke up. The Pope, satisfied with his gain of the cities of Romagna, made peace with the Venetians and devoted his energies to forming an Italian combination which should be strong enough to expel the French from Italy. Louis' reply was the summoning of a National Council at Tours, followed by a so-called General Council at Pisa.

Julius, however, was not diverted from his object, and in 1511 the Holy League was formed, consisting of the Pope, Ferdinand of Aragon, Henry VIII, and Venice. Gaston de Foix's brilliant victory at Ravenna in 1512, in which he lost his life, did little to check the tide of disaster to the French arms, and before the end of the year no French troops remained in Italy.

In spite of his failure Louis persisted in his Italian policy and secured the alliance of Venice; but at the battle of Novara in 1513 La Trémouille suffered a disastrous defeat and the French were again driven from Italy. Nor was this the only defeat sustained by the French in 1513; for an attempt of the Duke of Longueville to relieve Théroutanne, which was besieged by Henry VIII and Maximilian, resulted in the overwhelming overthrow of the French army at Guinegate (the battle of the Spurs), while Louis' ally, James IV of Scotland, was defeated and killed at Flodden Field.

From that time, however, Louis' fortunes improved.

He bought off the Swiss who were attacking the Duchy of Burgundy, and he made peace with Maximilian and Leo X, who had succeeded Julius II in 1513. In 1514 his wife, Anne of Brittany, died, and he made peace with England, marrying Mary Tudor, the sister of Henry VIII.

Louis' reign, which closed on January 1, 1515, had been inglorious and disastrous as far as foreign policy was concerned. In other respects the reign was beneficial to France. It saw the first evidence of the desire of the French for Eastern traffic, and in 1503 some merchants in Rouen fitted out two ships 'to trade in the Eastern seas'.¹ It was not, however, till the reign of Henry IV that a company was formed for trade with the Indies (1604). At home the reign of Louis XII was a time of material prosperity. Agriculture flourished, a good system of justice was maintained, and the resources of the country were developed. Louis, who was personally kindly and humane, well deserved the title of 'Pater Patriae'.

While Charles VIII's Italian expedition marks the beginning of modern times, with the accession of Francis I France enters upon a period in her history, the importance of which cannot be overestimated. To the student of political history his reign marks the definite opening of the great struggle between France and Germany of which we see the latest phase to-day.

His reign also sees the Renaissance movement in France at its height, and with it the beginning of a revolution in political thought, effected by writers who were the predecessors of Voltaire and Rousseau, and thus helped to prepare the way for the Revolution of 1789. The reign also witnessed not only the outbreak of the Reformation unde

¹ Malleon, *The Early French in India*, p. 5.

Luther in Germany, but also the growth of Protestant doctrines in France which led to political developments in the reign of Louis XIII, necessitating severe measures by Richelieu.

During the reign of Francis the spread of the reformed doctrines in France was opposed by the King from 1528 onwards. In 1523 the Sorbonne had taken action, but it was not till 1534 that the persecution of the Lutherans definitely began and was carried out with great cruelty, the works of Calvin (a Frenchman who had studied in Paris), Luther, Melanchthon, and Étienne Dolet being forbidden, and Dolet being executed. In other respects the reign is remarkable. As in Portugal, many Frenchmen had taken to the work of exploration. Trade with Brazil and Newfoundland had been opened in Louis XII's reign, and the Bretons had already developed the fisheries off Cape Breton. The famous Jacques Cartier between 1534 and 1541 explored the St. Lawrence, and named the surrounding country Nouvelle France. But Francis I, like Louis XIV, perhaps naturally, did not recognize the immense possibilities which were indicated by the voyages of these seamen from Dieppe and St. Malo. At any rate, in opposing the supremacy of the Spanish-Habsburg House, and for that purpose entering into an understanding amounting to an alliance with Turkey which continued till the present century, Francis was acting for the benefit of Europe.

The importance of the Renaissance movement in France, which first affected the French people after the invasion of Italy by Charles VIII, cannot indeed be exaggerated. It 'did much', it has been said, 'to prepare the way for the Revolution, and for this reason it is in France rather than in Italy or England that the interest of the Renaissance

mainly lies'. As with the Reformation movement, the tendency of the Renaissance was anarchic. Both the Reformation and the Renaissance left everything to the decision of the individual; for the leading writers of the time, bringing a critical and independent spirit to bear on their studies, rejected the teaching of the schoolmen and regarded the Middle Ages as a period of ignorance. The French supporters of the New Learning, such as Rabelais, had no sympathy with the Reformation, or with the form which Protestantism took in France. Rabelais, like Voltaire, favoured a just and enlightened despotism. At the close of the century Montaigne 'summed up in a most attractive form the scepticism which was the outcome of the French Revolution'. It remained for men like Rousseau, who came from Calvinistic Geneva, and for the Jansenists—Catholic Calvinists—to supply in the eighteenth century 'the motive power which was needed to carry the principles of the Renaissance and of the philosophers beyond the sphere of theory'.

As regards the poet Ronsard (born in 1527) and his followers, it has been truly said that their attitude towards the Renaissance was 'imitative rather than creative'; they were the imitators and translators of classical and Italian poetry, their aim being to give classical form to French literature. Later in the century the presence of Catharine de' Medici and of her followers in France made all things Italian fashionable.

In this Renaissance atmosphere Francis I was plunged on his accession. But though sympathetic towards the New Learning, he found during the first few years of his reign that questions, religious and political, often distracted his attention. The question of the relation of the Gallican Church to the Pope was settled shortly after the

French invasion of Italy in 1515, which was entered upon owing to the determination of the King to reconquer the Duchy of Milan. At Marignano on September 13 he won a decisive victory over the Swiss, and occupied Milan on October 4. Important results, religious and political, followed this victory, the Pope and the Swiss both adopting a conciliatory and friendly attitude towards the French.

Wars, however, were not allowed to interfere with the steady development of the many-sided Renaissance movement in France. The architectural no less than the literary side was fully exemplified under Francis and his successors. It was an age of building, and great works were in progress at Blois, Chenonceaux, Chambord, Chantilly, and the Louvre. Francis was the true creator of the modern Fontainebleau, in the castle of which Charles IV of France had founded his famous library. Charles VIII had planted his Italian colony at Amboise, while Louis XII had preferred Blois to all other castles. But under Francis Fontainebleau again became pre-eminent, and it was that king 'and the brilliant Pleiad of artists whom he gathered round him who were the true creators of the modern Fontainebleau'. Thither came Leonardo da Vinci, who died in France in 1529, Andrea del Sarto, Rosso, and Primaticcio, the two latter executing the plan designed by the architect Serlio for the new buildings. These men, assisted by a host of Italian and French artists, made Fontainebleau into the most magnificent palace in Europe. The Emperor Charles V was entertained there by Francis I, whose works were carried on by Henry II and Diana of Poitiers, Catharine de' Medici, Henry IV, who himself was a great decorator and builder, and Louis XIII.

At Bologna in August 1516 Francis made with Leo X the

famous Concordat, which in consideration of the renunciation of the Pragmatic Sanction, and an undertaking that the Pope's family should rule in Florence, granted to the King the right of nomination to bishoprics, abbeys, and conventual priories. Henceforward, the Church in France was under the despotic rule of its kings, while it was made obvious that no reform of the Church could be expected from any Pope of the House of Medici. The patronage of bishoprics and abbeys in the hands of such a king as Francis I rendered useless any attempt at reform from within. The impulse to reform, therefore, came necessarily from without. Equally conciliatory were the Swiss, who willingly agreed to an alliance with France, which was cemented by the Treaties of Geneva (November 7, 1515) and of Fribourg (November 29, 1516). Henceforward, till the Revolution of 1789, France could, as a rule, number the Swiss amongst her allies.

Meanwhile, Ferdinand the Catholic, who had been thoroughly alarmed at Francis's success in Italy, died (January 23, 1516), leaving to his grandson Charles Spain, the Netherlands, the kingdom of the Two Sicilies, and the New World. Like Wolsey, Charles viewed with apprehension the rapid growth of the French monarchy. Charles, however, was not prepared to enter into hostilities with Francis; for his position in Spain and the Netherlands was as yet insecure, and he was in need of money. Therefore he adopted the advice of his Flemish councillor, Chièvres, and concluded the Peace of Noyon on August 13, 1516, with Francis, who surrendered his claims on Naples but kept Milan, while Charles was betrothed to the infant daughter of the French King, and agreed to restore Spanish Navarre to the House of Albret. In December the Emperor Maximilian recognized

the treaty, and surrendered Brescia and Bergamo to Venice for 220,000 ducats. It only required the Treaty of London in October 1518, by which England restored Tournai to France, and agreed to the betrothal of the Dauphin to the Princess Mary, to remove all outstanding difficulties. Europe was now at peace, and England was pledged to take action against the aggressor.

In January 1519 the Emperor Maximilian died. His death marked the beginning of an important period in European history, for with the outbreak of the Franco-Austrian Wars modern diplomacy, international law, and the doctrine of the Balance of Power take their rise. Fifteen months before the death of Maximilian Luther had nailed his ninety-five theses on the door of the church at Wittenberg; in December 1520 he publicly burnt the Papal Bull of excommunication, and in the following year appeared before the Diet of Worms. So began German Reformation and the division of Germany into two religious camps—a fact which proved of the utmost importance to Francis in his wars with Charles V. On June 28, 1519, Charles was elected Emperor, the other candidates being Henry VIII and Francis, who had spent immense sums of money in attempts to bribe the Electors. But German sentiment declared unmistakably for Charles, and after his election the Habsburg House ruled over Spain, Germany, the Netherlands, the Two Sicilies, and a large part of the New World. The famous conflict between the Habsburgs and France now became inevitable, and it broke out in 1521. Immediate causes of war were easy to find. Henri d'Albret had not, in accordance with the Treaty of Noyon, been restored to Spanish Navarre; the French possession of Milan was a perpetual

cause of trouble, for it stood between the German and Italian possessions of the Emperor, who, moreover, claimed the Duchy of Burgundy. While it was the interest of Francis to begin hostilities without delay, it was the desire of Charles, hampered as he was with troubles in Spain and with the Lutheran movement in Germany, to postpone the outbreak of war as long as possible.

At the time of his election Charles was in Spain ; on May 26, 1520, he landed in England and with Henry VIII and Wolsey proceeded to Canterbury. After his departure from Sandwich, Henry met Francis on June 7 near Guines, at the ' Field of Cloth of Gold ', which was English ground, and shortly afterwards, on July 10, again saw Charles at Gravelines. Nothing certain is known of what passed at Gravelines, but probably nothing was actually settled, Wolsey's influence being in favour of a continuance of peace. Before the year had closed, however, Francis had resolved upon war, which, indeed, did not definitely break out till 1521, when the French had crossed the Pyrenees on behalf of the King of Navarre. The Imperialists replied by entering France in August, and at the same time laid siege to Tournai. At the end of the year Henry VIII had practically agreed to aid Charles, and both kings undertook to invade France in 1523. On the death of the Pope, Leo X, in December 1521, Charles secured in January 1522 the election of Adrian VI, a Fleming who had acted as viceroy in Spain.

That year proved somewhat disastrous to the French arms, for on April 27 Lautrec, the Governor of Milan, was defeated at La Bicocca, near Milan, by the troops of the Emperor and the Pope. The French forces were compelled to evacuate the Milanese, and in July an English force

invaded Picardy. In June Charles, on his way to Spain, where he remained till 1529, signed the Treaty of Windsor agreeing not to attack the Turks till Francis had been humiliated. The following year Pope Adrian VI agreed to the treaty, which was also joined by Milan, Genoa, Florence, and Venice. That year, 1523, therefore saw the Imperial position in Italy firmly established, and 'as far as diplomacy could make it so, one of the most successful of Charles's reign'.¹ The fortunes of Francis were far from promising. Charles, Duke of Bourbon, in July 1523 threw in his lot with Charles V; Henry VIII invaded France in the summer of 1524, advancing wellnigh to Paris; an Imperialist army invaded Provence, but failed to take Marseilles. Though the French army in Italy had failed to recover Milan, the Count of Guise defeated a German force on the Meuse, and the Spaniards were only partially successful. Francis, still resolved to retake Milan, besieged that city in the autumn of 1524. On February 25, 1525, the famous battle of Pavia was fought, 8,000 Frenchmen were killed, and Francis, having been taken prisoner, was conveyed to Valencia in June and to Madrid in August. Francis had failed through over-confidence. He had detached troops for an expedition to Naples, and for an attack on Genoa, and had sent his Grison mercenaries to defend Chiavenna.

For a time France seemed to be at the mercy of Charles. It appeared quite probable that he would occupy a position not unlike that of Charles the Great. But he had difficulties of his own. The Peasants' War—a serious rising of the German peasantry in 1524—still continued, the Turks were threatening, the Lutherans were rapidly increasing,

¹ Armstrong, *The Emperor Charles V*, vol. i, p. 137 (Macmillan & Co.).

Europe was realizing that Charles's victory might endanger its freedom. Already the idea of a balance of power was beginning to make itself felt. In order to secure his freedom Francis practically acceded to all the demands of Charles, and on January 13, 1526, the Treaty of Madrid was concluded. Francis resigned all his Italian claims and promised to restore Bourbon to his estates; he ceded his suzerainty over Flanders, Artois, and Tournay. The question of the cession of Burgundy was left to the decision of the States-General and the *Parlement* of Paris. The King of Navarre could no longer hope for support from Francis. On March 17 Francis was again in France, and on May 22 Charles was confronted by the League of Cognac, which included Pope Clement VII, Francis, Florence, Venice, and Francesco Sforza, under the protection of Henry VIII. The object of the League was ostensibly the preservation of the peace of Europe; but it was understood that if Charles refused its demands, which practically implied his withdrawal from Italy, the League would take action.

There was, however, no real danger to Charles from the allies. Francis made no attempt to interfere in Italy, Henry VIII was already occupied with the divorce question, and Italy was left to its fate. In July 1526 Milan and its citadel were occupied by the Imperial troops, and Sforza fell, while Moncada occupied Rome and forced Clement in September to agree to all his demands. Worse was to come, for on May 26, 1527, Rome was sacked by the Imperialist army, and on June 7 Clement was captured. The news of the sack of Rome stirred up Europe, and especially France and England. Francis at last took action, and Henry abandoned Wolsey's policy of masterly inactivity. The two monarchs had before the sack of Rome concluded an alliance, which in August took the form of the Treaty of Amiens

pledging both to enter upon an offensive war. Henry had now abandoned his claim to the French throne; and in July a French army occupied all Lombardy except Milan, with the result that Florence, Savoy, Mantua, and Genoa adopted the French cause. Naples, which seemed likely to fall into the hands of Lautrec and the French troops, was, however, saved owing to an unfortunate quarrel of Francis with Andrea Doria, who commanded a large force of galleys. The results of the alienation of Doria were most serious. The control of the Mediterranean passed from Francis to Charles, and in spite of Turkish efforts a few years later, it remained in the hands of the Emperor. In August and September disaster followed disaster. Lautrec died and the whole French army in the south of Italy capitulated, while in October Genoa was recaptured by Doria. In June 1529 Saint-Pol was defeated by a Spanish army at Landriano—a battle of immense importance, for by it the fate of Lombardy was settled. No further serious attempt by the French to occupy it was made for many a generation. It only required the reconciliation of Clement VII and the Emperor on June 29 at the Treaty of Barcelona to bring to an end the Treaty of Cognac.

The battle of Landriano and the Treaty of Barcelona induced Francis to enter into peace negotiations, while the growth of Lutheranism and the invasion of Hungary by Suleiman in May rendered the Emperor willing to treat. On August 3 the Treaty of Cambrai—arranged by Margaret, the aunt of Charles, and Louise of Savoy, the mother of Francis—was signed. Francis abandoned all his Italian claims, and undertook not to interfere with the Emperor's dealings with heretics in Germany. Charles did not insist on the cession of Burgundy, and released the

French Princes (who had been in Spain since the Treaty of Madrid). The Treaty was finally ratified at Piacenza by Charles, who after many years had left Spain, to be crowned at Bologna on February 24, 1530. For more than six years peace reigned between France and the Empire. During that period Charles found that his proposed extermination of the Lutheran heresy was impossible, owing to a great extent to the perpetually recurring Turkish menace. The retirement of Suleiman from Vienna in October 1529 had been followed by the formation of the Protestant League of Smalkalde and the consequent division of Germany into two religious camps. In May 1535 Charles sailed from Barcelona, captured Tunis, and gained much personal prestige by his successful attack on the Moslem pirates who, under Barbarossa, had for many years infested the Mediterranean. By this success Charles had struck a blow at the connexion between Francis and Suleiman. Already in 1525 and 1528 French envoys had visited the Porte, and there is no doubt that the growth of Barbarossa's power in the western Mediterranean was viewed with satisfaction by the French King. In 1535 a French envoy—La Forest—was sent to Constantinople to conclude a Franco-Turkish treaty. The fall of Tunis, however, lessened its value and it had no immediate results favourable to France. In February 1536 Francis opened his third war with Charles by seizing Savoy and occupying Turin. Charles replied by invading Provence and capturing Aix. But his enterprise proved a failure, as did a French invasion of the Netherlands. Barbarossa, 'the avowed ally of France', raided the Apulian coasts, and the Turks defeated the Imperial army at Essek. Both Charles and Francis were ready for peace, and on June 17, 1538, a truce was concluded at Nice. Francis kept his hold on Savoy and Piedmont, and at Aigues-Mortes

in July met Charles and led him to think that the peace just made would be permanent.

This seemed all the more likely as, some little time after this meeting, Charles was allowed to pass through France on his way to suppress a rising in Ghent. A joint expedition against Henry VIII was even discussed. No permanent peace between the two monarchs seemed, however, possible; for even in 1540 French diplomacy had brought about peace between Turkey and Venice, thus enabling the Turkish fleet to attack the coasts of Naples, Sicily, and even Spain. Moreover, the French and Turks supported the claims of John Sigismund to Hungary, although it had already been agreed that Ferdinand (Charles V's brother) should succeed. In the following year the disastrous expedition of Charles to Algiers took place; and Francis at once prepared for war, having secured as allies the Sultan Suleiman, the Kings of Denmark and Sweden, and the Duke of Cleves. The fourth war between Charles and Francis broke out in July 1542, and the French attacks were made on the frontiers of Spain and the Netherlands. While some success attended the invasion of Flanders and Artois, Francis failed to take Perpignan, the capital of Roussillon; and the advance of the Turks, allied with the French, roused an outburst of patriotism in Germany. Suleiman was held in check by Ferdinand in 1543, while Charles overthrew the Duke of Cleves. The alliance of Francis with the Turks and Barbarossa, and the destruction of Nice with the consequent enslavement of its population, roused the indignation of Europe. France and French Catholicism were disgraced. In February 1543 Henry VIII became the Emperor's ally, and Francis was isolated. Denmark and Sweden had been detached, the Lutherans in Germany would not support him; and though in April 1544 Enghien won a

brilliant victory at Ceresole, it had no satisfactory result. The real centre of operations during this war was on the Franco-German frontier. In July Charles invaded France, laying siege to St. Dizier, which made an heroic resistance, while Henry VIII landed at Calais and besieged Boulogne. Luckily for Francis, his opponents did not co-operate; Charles, who had advanced to Meaux, suddenly agreed to treat, and on September 18 the Treaty of Cr py was concluded. Charles made no attempt to assert his rights to the Duchy of Burgundy, and Francis ceded his claim to Naples and his suzerainty over Flanders and Artois. Arrangements were made for the marriage of the Duke of Orleans, who, however, died in September 1545. Charles retained Milan for his son Philip. Henry VIII, much to his irritation, found himself deserted by his ally, but, as has been well pointed out, the aims of the two kings had always been different. Henry 'wished to extend his dominions in Northern France; Charles desired only to cripple the French King that he might be free to deal with Germany and the Porte'.¹

Till June 1546, when the Treaty of Ardres was concluded, Henry continued the war. He had captured Boulogne, and in 1545 several indecisive naval fights took place in the Channel. By the treaty Henry engaged to restore Boulogne on receiving two millions of crowns. During 1545 the Huguenots in the south of France had suffered terrible persecutions, the result, it is said, of an arrangement between Francis and Charles for the opening of a vigorous campaign on behalf of Roman Catholicism. Francis died on March 31, 1547, in the fifty-third year of his age. His single-handed resistance to Charles V, his victory of Marignano, and his support of the Renaissance movement have been justly praised by

¹ Armstrong, *The Emperor Charles V*, vol. ii, p. 32 (Macmillan & Co.).

Marshal Tavannes. Francis had preserved French independence, and saved Europe from an Austro-Spanish supremacy.

Henry II had married Catharine de' Medici in 1533. On his accession the influence of the House of Guise at once became apparent, and Francis, Count of Aumale, who after 1550 became Duke of Guise, was one of the King's chief advisers. His sister, Mary of Lorraine, married James V of Scotland, and their daughter was Mary Stuart, better known as Mary Queen of Scots. Consequently, till the appearance of Presbyterianism in Scotland about the year 1554 French influence was paramount in Scotland. In order to check the growth of this influence, and to bring about the marriage of the young Queen of Scotland to Edward VI, Somerset marched into Scotland and won the battle of Pinkie. But in June 1548 a French squadron entered the Firth of Forth, landed troops, and finally carried Mary Stuart off from Dumbarton Castle to France, where she was affianced to the Dauphin Francis. England and France were at war till March 1550, when peace was made, England surrendering Boulogne for 400,000 crowns, instead of the two millions demanded by Henry VIII.

Henry II, freed from anxieties concerning England and Scotland, was now able to carry out the wish of the Duke of Guise and renew the contest with the Emperor. In alliance with Maurice of Saxony the French opened the campaign on March 13, 1552, against Charles, who seemed to be at the height of his power, and who was anxious to secure the succession to the Empire for his son Philip. At the time of the opening of hostilities Charles was ill at Innsbruck, but on Maurice's advance towards that town made a sudden, dramatic, and famous escape across the mountains into Carinthia. Henry, meanwhile, occupied the 'Trois Évêchés', Metz, Toul, and Verdun, and attempted to

seize Strassburg. He failed, however, in that attempt, but succeeded in capturing several towns in Luxemburg. In August 1552 Charles wisely agreed to the famous Treaty of Passau conceding freedom of religious worship to the Protestants. He was then able to concentrate his efforts upon the siege of Metz, which was defended by Francis, Duke of Guise, from October 1552 until January 11, 1553, when Charles withdrew his forces.

The war continued, the Imperial troops capturing Théroutanne and Hesdin in 1553; but no important battle took place, and in February 1556 the Truce of Vaucelles was concluded. Meanwhile, in January 1556 Charles had resigned the kingdom of Spain to his son Philip. In the following September he also resigned the Imperial crown—his brother Ferdinand being elected Emperor two years later. Another war between France and Spain broke out in 1556 owing to the wish of the Duke of Guise to revive French claims on Naples. His attempt failed, and till 1700 Milan, Sicily, and Naples remained in the hands of the Spanish Habsburgs. It was necessary for Guise to return to France, for in August 1557 the French had suffered an overwhelming defeat by the Spaniards in the battle of St. Quentin. However, in January 1558 Guise captured Calais. The last action in the war took place at Gravelines, where a French force under the Marshal de Termes was defeated, and the Marshal himself captured, on July 13.

The Treaty of Cateau-Cambrésis was concluded on April 3, 1559. Charles V had died the previous September, and Mary of England on November 17. Philip, whose presence was urgently demanded in Spain, where heresy had raised its head, had great difficulty in finding money for the war and was anxious for peace. Henry II, too, had similar reasons for ending the war. The Cardinal of Lorraine

urged him to make peace so that he might turn his attention to the extirpation of the Huguenots. By the terms of the treaty France kept the three bishoprics, Metz, Toul, and Verdun; she had taken possession of Calais, but she lost Spanish Navarre. With the conclusion of the treaty the struggle for the possession of Italy ceases, and it is not till the days of the great Napoleon that France again definitely aims at supremacy in the Italian Peninsula. Since the outbreak of the war in 1521 with Charles V, France had, in spite of many mistakes in policy, laid Europe under a deep debt of gratitude; for she had resisted 'the dangerous supremacy of the Austro-Spanish House', and had 'foiled the attempt of Charles to establish a universal monarchy in Europe'.¹ Both Philip and Henry were resolved to crush heresy in their dominions, and consequently till the Peace of Westphalia in 1648 the religious question occupies the chief place in European history. Already a religious revolution was in progress in Scotland, the results of which were not fully realized in France at that time. That revolution—marked by the establishment of Presbyterianism between 1554 and 1560—brought to an end the famous connexion between France and Scotland which had been first established in 1295 and illustrated by the battles of Neville's Cross, Flodden, and Solway Moss.


No sooner was the Treaty of Cateau-Cambrésis concluded than Henry II proposed to take measures to exterminate the Protestants. To his astonishment he found that his policy was opposed in the *Parlement* of Paris. Before he had time to break down that opposition, he met with an accident at a tournament and died in July 1559. Shortly after his death, while the rivalry with Spain showed no real abatement, and the Scottish alliance had ended, more

¹ Johnson, *Europe in the Sixteenth Century*, p. 258 (Rivingtons).

friendly relations with England ensued and continued till 1688. But for the ensuing forty years France, involved in civil war, had little European influence.


THE HOUSE OF LORRAINE AND GUISE

René II, Duke of Lorraine and Bar, d. 1508



HENRY IV'S ANCESTRY

Charles, Duke of Vendôme



The Wars of Religion

THE first mutterings which indicated the coming of a religious storm became distinctly audible after the conclusion of the Peace of Cateau-Cambrésis in April 1559. Several towns, such as La Rochelle and Poitiers, contained many Protestants, and in 1558 it was stated that the Lutherans numbered some 40,000. There is no doubt that during Henry II's reign the Reformers had perfected an organization of their Churches which 'in the face of danger became political, and even military'. The death of Henry II placed the French crown on the head of Francis II, the husband of Mary Queen of Scots, and the chief power in the hands of the Guises. The 'tumult of Amboise', a rising with the object of removing the King from Guise influence, led to the arrest of Condé, who was condemned to death. On December 5, 1560, Francis II died and was succeeded by Charles IX, who for a time was under the guardianship of Catharine de' Medici and Antony of Navarre.

The death of Francis II saved the life of Condé, and the Guises were baulked of their prey. Catharine at once aimed at mediating between the two parties. But the mutual animosity of the Catholics and Reformers rendered her policy at the time impossible of execution. At the meeting of the States-General at Orleans in August 1561 the Chancellor L'Hôpital emphasized this fact, which became still more evident at the Colloquy of Poissy between Catholic and Calvinist divines in September. For the time being it was impossible to separate the questions of political and religious

reform. The Edict of January 1562, however, made an attempt to secure toleration, and the Huguenots received provisionally legal recognition. But the uncompromising hostility to the Reformers of the nobility, the clergy, and the lawyers was soon apparent; they and the Catholics generally were determined to revoke the Edict as soon as possible. Two massacres of the Huguenots made war inevitable. The first took place on March 1, 1562, when the Duke of Guise massacred the fifty or sixty Huguenots at Vassy in the modern Department of the Haute-Marne. A second slaughter of the Huguenots at Sens was followed in May by the outbreak of hostilities. For a year the First War of Religion continued, the Huguenots securing the alliance of Queen Elizabeth at the price of the cession of Dieppe and Havre. In October 1562 the Catholics captured Rouen, and the unstable Antony of Navarre, the father of the future Henry of Navarre, died of a wound received during the siege. His brother Condé thereupon became the Huguenot leader, but was captured in December at the battle of Dreux, when Marshal St. André was killed and Montmorency captured. Early in the year 1563 Coligny, at the head of a Huguenot force, captured several towns in Normandy, while the Duke of Guise besieged Orleans. However, on February 18 Guise was assassinated; and on March 12, in spite of the opposition of Coligny, the first civil war ended, owing to Condé's influence, with the Pacification of Amboise. Condé and Montmorency were exchanged, and, with certain limitations, liberty of worship was permitted to the Huguenots. Catharine seems honestly to have endeavoured to carry out the terms of the treaty, being herself in agreement with the opinion of L'Hôpital that the King should act as judge and mediator, and should enforce the terms of the Pacification

upon the two religious parties. The peace was immediately followed by the union of Catholics and Huguenots against England, and on July 25 the English were driven out of Havre. On April 13, 1564, the Treaty of Troyes re-established friendly relations between the English and French Governments.

Catharine's policy had for the moment triumphed. Like Elizabeth of England she had been well educated, she was a lover of Art, and had literary tastes. Like Elizabeth, too, she wished to be at the head of affairs, to be thoroughly acquainted with all State business. Like the English Queen, too, she loved flattery; like her she was a believer in compromise. But there the resemblance ends, for in her conduct of affairs she was a true follower of Machiavelli. She trusted no one, she regarded religion as a mere engine of government, in her Court there existed no high moral standard. In the early spring of 1564 she and the young King made a tour through several of the French provinces (they passed the winter in the south); and in June 1565, at a Conference at Bayonne, they met the Queen of Spain (Catharine's daughter) and the Duke of Alva. What Catharine's object was at this interview has never been disclosed, though there is no doubt that Alva urged that strong measures should be taken with regard to the chief Huguenot leaders, and that the Chancellor L'Hôpital should be dismissed. That interview, however, led to the second civil war, for the Huguenots were convinced that the question of their suppression had been the chief matter of discussion.

In September 1567 a number of the lesser nobility from Picardy and Champagne, suspicious of the movements of some Swiss Catholic troops, met at Meaux; this led to the Conspiracy of Meaux, the object of which was to seize

the King and to demand full liberty of conscience and the removal of the Cardinal of Lorraine from the royal councils. William, Prince of Orange, refused to join the Huguenots; and the conspirators, having failed in their attempt to capture the King or the Cardinal, marched under Condé to St. Denis, where a fierce though indecisive battle was fought. The Constable Montmorency was killed, and by the efforts of Catharine and L'Hôpital the Edict of Longjumeau (March 1568), which confirmed the Treaty of Amboise, ended the second civil war. Respite from hostilities was only enjoyed in France for a few months. Imitating the conspirators of Meaux, the Cardinal of Lorraine formed a plot for the seizure of Condé and other Huguenot leaders. Though he failed in his object, he was supported in his attitude by the *Parlements* throughout France; and the third civil war broke out in September 1568 and continued for two years. Hitherto Catharine had maintained a mediatory policy, and was probably caught unawares by the outbreak of the second civil war. She now took a decided anti-Protestant attitude, and the Catholics were the aggressive party. L'Hôpital in despair retired in 1568, and Catharine adopted the policy of the Guises and revoked the edicts of toleration. On March 13, 1569, was fought the battle of Jarnac (a cavalry skirmish), when the Catholics under the young Duke of Anjou (who became later King Henry III) obtained a victory which at first seemed decisive. Though Condé surrendered, he was killed after the battle, and Coligny succeeded him as leader of the Huguenots. A mixed force of German, French, and Flemish troops under William of Orange and Louis of Nassau united with Coligny on June 12 at Limoges and advanced against Poitiers, which was defended by Henry, Duke of Guise, son of Francis. On

the advance of the Duke of Anjou the siege of Poitiers was raised, and on October 3. Coligny was defeated in a most decisive fashion at the battle of Moncontour. Anjou, however, having failed to take Saint-Jean-d'Angely, resigned his command in favour of the Duke of Montpensier. The Huguenots were by no means crushed—they were in possession of La Rochelle—and Coligny, who had recovered from a wound, marched to the Rhône, where he fought an indecisive battle.

Urged by Francis Montmorency, Catharine now favoured peace, and on August 8, 1570, the Peace of Saint-Germain ended the Third War of Religion. The Huguenots gained liberty of conscience, liberty to hold services in two cities in each of the twelve French provinces, and the right to hold for two years, by way of security, the cities of La Rochelle, Montauban, Cognac, and La Charité.

From this time the influence of a third party, known as the *Politiques*, makes itself felt. That party, which made its appearance after the close of the first civil war, was Catholic, and its leading representative then was L'Hôpital. 'Let us keep unadulterated', he had said at the meeting of the Estates at Orleans in 1560, 'the name of Christian.' After the Peace of Saint-Germain the party favoured a project for the marriage of Henry of Navarre (the next in succession after the House of Valois) and Margaret, the youngest sister of Charles IX. The *Politiques* seem to have cautiously suggested that project for the severance of the Gallican Church from Rome which was openly advocated at one period of Louis XIV's reign. And the fact that neither Catharine nor Charles IX had, at the time of the Peace of Saint-Germain, any marked hostility to the Huguenots, seemed to offer some chance of a settle-

ment on the basis of toleration. The Huguenots had obtained excellent terms by the Peace of Saint-Germain. It was suggested by a Catholic writer that their success was due to their influence on the Royal Council. There is little doubt that the leaders of their party hoped to control the Crown again.

It has always been doubtful whether the Massacre of St. Bartholomew was 'the work of momentary passion' or was the result of careful premeditation. The Huguenots believed that it was planned at Bayonne; but it is more than doubtful if the French Court had come to any decision regarding its policy towards the Huguenots, even as late as the summer of 1572. It seems, however, certain that the course of the war in the Netherlands brought matters to a crisis. Teligny, the son-in-law of Coligny, had held out to Charles IX the hope that, in the event of war with Spain, Flanders and Artois would be incorporated with France. Though England, as ever, was strongly opposed to the annexation of Flanders and Antwerp by France, the plan of an independent sovereignty of the Netherlands was favourably regarded by Elizabeth, especially after La Marck's seizure of Brille on April 1. In April a defensive alliance between England and France was concluded, and English volunteers crossed to Flushing, while Louis of Nassau, with a Huguenot force, took Mons. It indeed seemed that Charles IX and Catharine were about to anticipate the policy of Henry IV at the opening of the following century, and to head a combination against the German and Spanish branches of the House of Habsburg. French troops were being raised and the French fleet was ready.

But though apparently in agreement with an anti-Spanish policy, Catharine had already (in February) decided to get

rid of Coligny and to attack the Huguenots. All depended, however, on the success of movements against Alva. Unfortunately for the supporters of the anti-Habsburg movement, Spanish victories destroyed the hopes of the Huguenots. La Noue was driven from Valenciennes; a force under Genlis was cut to pieces; on July 19 Spanish troops in Italy threatened the southern provinces of France; the Governors of Burgundy and Picardy warned Catharine that their provinces were in no condition to fight Spain. The Italian diplomat, Michieli, on behalf of Venice urged her not to aid the Turk by breaking with France, while the policy of Queen Elizabeth was, as ever, uncertain. Moreover, Coligny was the object of the hatred of the Guises, and the populace of Paris was, as ever, violently opposed to the Huguenots. Further, an anti-Spanish war would mean the establishment of the influence of Coligny over the weak King, and the consequent loss of the influence of Catharine over her son. Catharine believed that, were Coligny dead, Huguenotism would soon cease to be an important force, and that France would enjoy a period of peace.

On August 18 the marriage of Henry of Navarre with the Princess Margaret was solemnized, large numbers of the Huguenot nobility flocking to Paris. On the 22nd an attempt was made to assassinate Coligny, who escaped with a wound. On the 24th the Massacre of St. Bartholomew took place, and massacres in the provinces followed. Coligny, his son-in-law Teligny, and several thousands were slain. Henry of Navarre and the young Condé were spared, but were forced to accept Roman Catholicism.

For a short time it was believed throughout Europe that the massacre would be followed by a close alliance between France and Spain.

Though Elizabeth and the Emperor were shocked and Philip and the Pope delighted on hearing of the massacre, no Franco-Spanish alliance followed, and William of Orange continued to hope for French assistance. Catharine was satisfied by regaining her influence over the King of France, and made no attempt to carry out an heroic policy either at home or abroad. A fourth war with the Huguenots did indeed break out in consequence of the Government's attempts to seize certain towns held against it. Of these La Rochelle and Sancerre were the most important. The arrival of the Polish envoys, to offer the crown of Poland to Henry of Anjou, who was actively attacking La Rochelle, rendered peace necessary. The Polish ambassadors acted as mediators, and while Henry of Anjou was offered—and accepted—the crown of Poland, the Treaty of La Rochelle on June 24, 1578, ended the war. In La Rochelle, Nîmes, and Montauban (Sancerre being added in August), liberty to hold their services was granted to the Huguenots; they were also promised liberty of conscience.

The war which had just closed differed from the previous wars not only in being a war of sieges, but also because the Huguenots, as later in the days of Richelieu, attempted to establish 'a representative federal system' which was gradually to be extended over France. This proposed establishment of a non-official organization independent of the Crown was simply revolution. This attempt to abolish the absolutism of the Crown and to substitute an elective kingship checked by the National Estates was not successful; and the whole situation was shortly revolutionized by the death of Charles IX on May 30, 1574, and by the accession of Henry of Anjou, who at once resigned the crown of Poland. In February 1574 the fifth civil war had broken out owing to

the demands of the Huguenots for complete liberty of conscience and of worship throughout France. Added to these demands came a manifesto from the *Politiques*, who in 1575 formed an alliance with the Huguenots, demanding toleration. The war, uninteresting in its early stages, was somewhat enlivened by the escape from prison of Henry of Navarre, and of Catharine's youngest son, Francis, Duke of Alençon, who now favoured the Huguenots.

In May 1576 the Peace of Monsieur, as the King's next brother was now styled, ended the war—a peace most unwelcome to the intolerant Catholics. For, by the terms of the Peace, Henry of Navarre and Henry of Condé were given the Governorships of Guienne and Picardy respectively. From that time the Catholic party under Guise was as much occupied in agitating against the Crown as in opposing the Huguenots. The Catholic opposition took the form of Leagues; the first of these was organized in 1576 by the Governor of Péronne, who refused to surrender the town, in accordance with the terms of the Peace of Monsieur, to Condé. The nominal object of this and other Leagues was the defence of the Roman Catholic Church, and the passing of certain resolutions by the Estates which were about to meet. Their leader was Henry of Guise, who now adopted a democratic policy, probably with an eye to the crown. The meeting of the States-General had no result, since the Huguenots sent no deputies in view of the attitude of the League; and before it separated civil war had again broken out. The meeting of the Estates afforded evidence of a growing revolutionary spirit, which showed itself in ignoring the terms of the Peace of Monsieur and in opening negotiations with Spain. 'Catholicism had not merely religious but deep social roots in France.' The Massacre of

St. Bartholomew was a deliberate act on the part of the municipal authorities of Paris, and the massacres in other towns had testified to the popularity of a policy which aimed at the extermination of Huguenotism.

The League of Picardy in 1576, which was one of the several Leagues or Associations formed by Catholics since 1565—one of which, La Sainte Ligue in Champagne, of which Guise was Governor, had openly threatened the Valois dynasty—was, indeed, not successful in extending its operations over France. It had, however, one important result, namely of preventing Condé from assuming his Governorship of Picardy and so establishing a connexion with the Protestants in the Netherlands. From 1576 to 1584, a period which saw the outbreak and conclusion of two short religious wars, political discontent was simply smouldering, discontent against the Crown was growing, while the influence of Guise was steadily increasing.

The sixth and seventh civil wars do not call for much notice. The former lasted from March 1577 till September. The Duke of Anjou, as Alençon was now called, no longer supported the Huguenots, and led an army against them. Some success attended the Catholic forces, but their diversion towards the Netherlands and the differences which arose among their leaders led, in September 1577, to the Treaty of Bergerac, which ended the war. The Huguenots remained in a fairly strong position, while Henry III was chiefly anxious to escape from the influence of the Guises. Not till April 1580 did war (the seventh civil war) again break out, the immediate cause being the seizure by Henry of Navarre of Cahors—part of the dower of his wife. The siege of La Fère, which Condé wished in vain to keep, was the only other interesting feature in the war. It was ended in November

by the Peace of Fleux, which confirmed the Treaty of Bergerac.

The years immediately following the Peace of Fleux were critical for the French monarchy. In September 1580 Anjou accepted the sovereignty of the Netherlands; and it seemed that if only Henry III would adopt a vigorous foreign policy, he might overthrow the influence of Guise, stamp out sedition, and find himself at the head of a united nation. In June 1582-3 French expeditions were sent to assist Portugal against Spain in the Azores, and there was talk of a marriage between Anjou and Elizabeth. But everything played into the hands of Guise. The Azores expeditions were destroyed by a Spanish fleet in 1583; Elizabeth, pursuing the policy which has been uniformly adopted by English Governments since the days of Edward III, was opposed to a French sovereignty over the Netherlands. In June 1584 Anjou, who had failed in the Netherlands, died; and the following month William of Orange was assassinated. A new situation was at once created. Henry of Navarre, a heretic, was now heir presumptive. The Catholic League at once received fresh life. During the winter of 1584-5 that League was carefully organized, in reality for 'the suppression of heresy and tyranny', but with the ostensible object of convening the three Estates, and restoring the *Parlement* and nobility to their privileges. Simultaneously the Cardinal of Bourbon and Guise made a secret treaty with Philip of Spain, who, recognizing Bourbon as the heir to the French throne, was to receive French assistance in all his schemes. The Catholic League, the centre of which was Paris, somewhat anticipated the action of the Constituent Assembly in France in 1789; and in the following year 'France was threatened with the tyranny of a Central Club with its affiliated societies whose

authority was maintained partly by terrorism, partly by the fanaticism excited through the preaching of friars and Jesuits'.¹

On the death of Henry III in 1589 the crown of France passed to Henry of Navarre, henceforward known as Henry IV. He was already famed for his courage and military knowledge. He was loved by all who knew him, and the French people were naturally attracted to one who was accessible to the humblest and who had all the French love of honour and glory.

In 1589 France seemed at the lowest ebb of her fortunes, and the foes of Henry calculated upon such a continuance of the religious divisions that they would be enabled practically to partition France. In spite, however, of appearances Henry found supporters in unexpected quarters. Sixtus V before his death in 1590 showed by negotiations with Henry that he did not favour the dismemberment of France; and though his successor Gregory XIV supported Philip II, Clement VIII from 1592 gradually became a strong supporter of the new Bourbon ruler. On Henry's accession civil war broke out once more and continued till 1595. The League was now openly fighting against the Crown, but to strengthen its position it proclaimed Henry's uncle, the Cardinal of Bourbon, as Charles X. On the other hand, Henry undertook to consider the question of his adoption of Catholicism, and so gained the support of many Catholic nobles. Against the forces of the Duc de Mayenne, brother of Henry of Guise, he could not at first make a stand, but in September, 1589, in the battle at Arques near Dieppe, he defeated his foes, though he, as yet, was not strong enough to take Paris.

¹ Johnson, *Europe in the Sixteenth Century*, p. 427.

The following year, 1590, was of immense importance in the history of Henry's fortunes. Anjou, Maine, and Normandy, with the exception of Rouen, were freed from the power of the League, and though Philip II secretly aided Mayenne, Henry, on March 14, won a decisive victory in the famous battle of Ivry, not far from Dreux. Shortly afterwards he besieged Paris, and that city anticipated the events of 1870-1 by the endurance which it showed during the privations incident upon a siege. In the early autumn Parma, in order to prevent the French capital from falling into the hands of Henry, suspended his operations in the Low Countries; and at the head of a Spanish army he relieved Paris, which was now, for a time, safe from all danger of starvation. The 'Sixteen' who ruled in the city were openly partisans of Spain; like the Jacobins of 1793-4 they favoured the most violent and revolutionary schemes, and they were especially hostile to the heretical supporters of the 'King of Navarre'. Their violence, however, benefited Henry, as the moderates in Paris now rapidly increased in numbers. Early the following year Parma again entered France and raised the siege of Rouen, defeating Henry in February 5, 1592, at Aumâle. In May Conti, Henry's lieutenant-general in the north-west, was defeated by Mercœur, but in October, at Villemur on the Tarn, an army of the League suffered a severe defeat. Neither side so far had won any decisive victory.

The old Cardinal of Bourbon, *le Roi de la Ligue*, had died in May 1590; and Philip of Spain now claimed the French throne for his daughter Elizabeth, as the eldest daughter of the eldest daughter of Henry II. At the States-General, which Mayenne summoned in January 1593, the Spanish Ambassador proposed that the French crown should be

given to the Infanta. But the plans of Philip and the 'Sixteen' suffered a severe shock when, on May 17, it was announced that Henry was willing to accept the Catholic faith. Events now moved rapidly. The States-General were swept away. On July 8 Henry took Dreux; and on July 23 a general truce was proclaimed. Henry, now that he had accepted Catholicism, found that he had the support of a large majority of French Catholics, while his opponents realized that they had never appreciated the strength of royalism in France. On March 22, 1594, he entered Paris not only without opposition but amid the greatest enthusiasm. Adhesions and capitulations rapidly followed. Charles II of Lorraine and the Duke of Guise made terms before the end of the year; in the following year (September 1595) Henry received Papal absolution, by the wish of Clement VIII; and shortly afterwards Mayenne submitted.

The war with Spain, however, continued: Henry formally declaring war on that Power in November, and in the campaign of Fontaine-Françoise he drove the Spaniards over the Saone. Spanish successes, however, made it clear that without allies Henry could not hope for a decisive victory over his foes, among whom were Charles Emmanuel of Savoy, and Mercœur in Brittany. He then signed an alliance with England in May 1596 (Treaty of Greenwich), which was shortly afterwards joined by the United Provinces; after a six months' siege he took Amiens, the Spanish headquarters in the north-east of France. Both sides were now ready to treat, and on May 2, 1598, immediately after the publication of the Edict of Nantes, the Treaty of Vervins ended the war. England and the United Provinces were abandoned, the terms of the Treaty of Greenwich being ignored. France had now passed safely through two crises—

a political and a religious one. Had Spain not been fully occupied by the revolt of the Netherlands France might have been partitioned between the Habsburgs and the Guises. The struggle in the Netherlands nullified the advantages which Spain otherwise would have gained by the war for the aggrandizement of the Guises—the so-called Wars of Religion—in France.

The religious crisis came to an end through Henry IV's acceptance of Catholicism, though as a matter of fact Gallicanism had won the day. It seemed that France might have a Gallican Church independent of the Papacy. The situation was somewhat similar to that in Louis XIV's reign, when the submission of the Papacy alone prevented the setting up of an independent Gallican Church. It was, however, Henry IV's interest to preserve by a Concordat the connexion between the French Church and the Papacy, and to recall the Jesuits, who, finding themselves unpopular with the French Church, the *Parlement* of Paris, and the Sorbonne, became a strong support of the Bourbon monarchy. While Catholicism was henceforth the State religion the Huguenots, by the Edict of Nantes (April 13, 1598), received liberty of worship and liberty of conscience. They obtained eight towns, and were allowed to keep up a force of 4,000 men. The Edict has been described as 'a treaty between two powers comparatively equal'.¹ It was not till the rise of Richelieu that the political existence of the Huguenots ended; it was not till the reign of Louis XIV that their religion was proscribed.

In 1598 France was at peace. The Edict of Nantes secured for the Huguenots liberty of conscience, though it left their political aims unsatisfied. That this was so became

¹ Armstrong, *The French Wars of Religion*, p. 44.

evident early in Louis XIV's reign, and it was not till 1629 that Richelieu succeeded in destroying the political power of the Huguenots. The Edict of Nantes, the Treaty of Vervins, the submission of the League, and the absolutism of Henry IV all contributed in 1598 to give France for a few years external and internal peace. During the remaining twelve years of the reign Henry and the Duke of Sully, the Superintendent of the Finances, were engaged on the work of restoration and rehabilitation so necessary after the long period of civil wars.

Sully, who in many of his ideas anticipated Colbert, proved an admirable administrator; he was fully alive to the importance of the development of agriculture and of financial reform. Sully realized that France could sell the surplus of her food to other nations at considerable profit to herself; he therefore reclaimed immense tracts of hitherto uncultivated land. This policy was wise at a period in European history when war between nations was so frequent an event, and especially so in the case of France. She now became self-supporting as regards the necessities of life, and was able to amass large amounts of gold and silver, more especially as Sully prohibited the exportation of these precious metals. He was however forced, by the intervention of Henry, to give partial encouragement to manufactures, such as those connected with silk at Lyons and Nîmes, and with glass and pottery at Paris and Nevers. Moreover, Henry encouraged the construction not only of roads but also of a great canal between the Loire and the Seine. In the matter of finance, Sully devoted his chief efforts to checking corruption, and made no attempt to introduce a better system of taxation. He was content to enforce the proper observance of the existing system, the chief novelty which he introduced being the *paulette*, a tax paid annually by judicial

and financial officials—and which enabled them to pass on their offices to their heirs. A class of hereditary officials was thus created, which was certainly not to the advantage of France.

Between 1598 and 1610, when he died, Henry IV was, it is said, hesitating between a Spanish alliance and a war for the Protestant cause in Germany. In 1609 he decided to oppose the Habsburgs on the Rhine; in 1610 he allied himself with the Protestant Union. But his death in May, by the hand of Ravallac, put an end to his schemes.

FRANCE

1610 - 1715

English Miles

0 50 100 150



French boundary in 1610

Acquisitions under Henry IV 1589-1610

" " Louis XIII 1610-1643

" " Louis XIV 1643-1715

The Early Bourbons and the Thirty Years' War

ON Henry IV's death the Bourbon monarchy was firmly established, and order after the religious wars was restored. But the forces of disorder were, during his reign, checked rather than annihilated. The nobles still wielded considerable power as provincial governors, though they were to some extent checked by agents of the Crown and by the growing tendency of the towns to shake themselves free from the influence of the great lords. The Huguenots, too, had gained by the Edict of Nantes a considerable amount of local independence which they, before many years were over, endeavoured to extend. Since the institution of the *paulette*, members of the *Parlement* of Paris could, on paying an annual tax to the Crown, secure themselves in their offices, which they could hand on to their heirs. The necessity for the rise of a statesman in France was rarely so obvious as during the first thirteen years of the reign of Louis XIII, when France was ruled by the Queen Mother, Marie de' Medici. During that period the power and selfishness of the great nobles were manifested to the detriment of the national interests, while the Huguenot leaders devoted their energies to personal quarrels. In order to preserve a precarious domestic peace the Queen Mother endeavoured in vain to bribe the princes, who added to the Regent's anxieties by forming themselves into two parties—that of the Guises, and that of the Prince of Condé. Sully had resigned his office of *Surintendant* in January 1611, and the Queen relied mainly on Concini, an Italian adven-

turer who had married Leonora Galigai, the Queen Mother's confidante.

Matters came to a crisis in 1614, when civil war was with difficulty averted by the Treaty of St. Menehould (May 15). The treaty was followed by the meeting of the States-General on October 27. It was the last assembly held before the famous States-General in 1789; otherwise it was of no great importance, and it separated in the following year. Richelieu, however, as the deputy for the clergy of Poitou, made his mark during the debates, and his speeches were evidently appreciated by Marie de' Medici and her favourite, Concini. At the close of the year 1615 the double marriage which had been arranged in 1612 took place. The eldest daughter of Marie was sent to Spain to marry Philip IV, and Louis XIII married the Infanta Anne of Austria. On her return the Queen Mother was forced to agree to the Treaty of Loudun (May 3, 1616), in order to avoid a war with Condé, who was supported by the Huguenots. By that treaty Louis and his mother agreed to continue the existing concessions to the Huguenots and the existing privileges of the *Parlements*, and also to maintain the freedom of the Gallican Church. Not appeased by this surrender, Condé endeavoured to effect the fall of Concini, but the Queen Mother took the bold step of incarcerating Condé himself in the Bastille on September 1. In the following year Marie de' Medici was herself deprived of power, and Louis XIII, under the influence of a certain Luynes, caused Concini to be shot on April 24, 1617, and his mother to be exiled to the castle of Blois. Attempts to win popularity by reforms did not strengthen Louis' position; the escape of the Queen Mother from Blois and her subsequent alliance with the rebel nobles added to his difficulties; and it was not till the Treaty of Angoulême

in 1619, and the Treaty of Angers in 1620, were signed that Louis was able to deal with a rising of the Huguenots, which, however, proved not a very serious affair.

Its main interest lies in the fact that, while on the campaign, Luynes died on December 15, 1621, and in the following year Condé, now restored to favour, persuaded Louis to lead the royal army against the Huguenots. Success attended the King, and on October 19 the Treaty of Montpellier ended the war. The Edict of Nantes was confirmed, La Rochelle and Montauban were left to the Huguenots as *places de sûreté*, and all political meetings were prohibited. The only matter of interest in the years immediately preceding 1624 in the history of France is the gradual rise of Richelieu, who in 1622 became a cardinal. May 4, 1624, is, however, an important date in French history. On that day Richelieu may be said to have entered upon his famous ministry, which continued till his death eighteen years later. Moreover, in that year France again made herself felt in the politics of Europe.

The Thirty Years' War which had broken out in 1618 was raging, and before the end of 1624 France had become the ally of Holland, the match between Prince Charles and Henrietta Maria was arranged, and French troops, in alliance with Venice and Savoy, occupied the important Valteline Valley. Early the following year James I was succeeded by his son Charles, who married Henrietta Maria in June. Before, however, France could take an active part in the Thirty Years' War it was necessary to deal forcibly with the Huguenots, who were curiously enough favoured by Spain, and who, under Soubise, raised a revolt in 1625. Richelieu dealt with the situation in a masterly manner. He forced the Huguenots to sue for peace, which was made at La Rochelle on February

5, 1626; and by handing back the Valteline to the Grisons, on the understanding that the Spaniards would not attempt to march through the valley, he secured peace with Spain by the Treaty of Monçon on May 10. The Huguenots, finding themselves without allies, were furious, and the following year (1627) again revolted. The operations centred round La Rochelle, which was besieged by the royal forces. A relieving force under Buckingham arrived from England, on the pretext that the French Protestants were badly treated. The English expedition was a failure, and returned to England at the end of the year. It was not, however, till October 1628 that the Huguenots, after an heroic resistance in La Rochelle, submitted. Before peace could be made a fresh crisis had arisen in North Italy, where the Duchy of Mantua, left vacant by the death of Vincenzo di Gonzaga on December 27, 1627, was claimed by his nearest male heir, Charles Gonzaga, the Duke of Nevers, then Governor of Champagne, and by Charles Emmanuel of Savoy, who was fiercely hostile to France. Spain sided with the latter and besieged Casale, the key of the valley of the Po, which was held by a small number of Frenchmen. Louis and Richelieu, however, crossed the Alps; Charles Emmanuel yielded; Casale was relieved; and Richelieu in April formed a great Italian League which included France, the Pope, Venice, Genoa, Mantua, and Savoy. Italy was thus freed from dependence upon Spain, with which Power the Huguenots under Rohan had now made alliance. Their resistance was in vain, for even Charles I had abandoned their cause; and on June 23, 1629, the Peace of Alais re-established the Edict of Nantes with important alterations justified by the fact that the late rising of the Huguenots had become political and not merely religious. Louis

returned, in July, in triumph to Paris, and on September 14 Richelieu joined him at Fontainebleau. He found himself threatened by the opposition of the Queen Mother, who had allied herself to Gaston of Orleans, the younger brother of Louis and the heir presumptive. At this crisis Louis firmly supported Richelieu, who in November received the title of *Premier Ministre d'État*.

His difficulties both at home and abroad were still considerable. However, he partly satisfied Gaston by offering him the Governorship of Amboise and Orleans, instead of Champagne and Burgundy, and the jealous Prince returned from Lorraine to France in January 1630. Meanwhile Richelieu was compelled to set out for Italy to settle the Mantuan succession question and to save Mantua and Casale, which were threatened by Imperialist armies. His object was not to conquer Italian provinces, but to secure some position which 'would enable France at any time to interfere decisively in Italy'. Charles Emmanuel, the unstable Duke of Savoy, fled from Rivoli at the approach of Richelieu at the head of an army in March, and on March 25 Pinerolo was in the hands of the French. In May Richelieu met Louis XIII at Grenoble, returned with him to Savoy, and carried out the reduction of the Duchy. But here his success ended. Owing to the defeat of Christian IV of Denmark and his retirement from the 'Thirty Years' War, the Emperor was able to send troops against Mantua, which fell into their hands on July 17, thus enabling assistance to be given to Spinola, who was besieging Casale.

Charles Emmanuel of Savoy died on July 26, and his successor Victor Amadeus, who had married the sister of Louis XIII, adopted a waiting policy. Under these circumstances Richelieu wisely allowed his agent Giulio Mazarin to arrange

a truce at Rivalta. A waiting policy was wise, for events were in 1630 moving rapidly in Richelieu's favour. In spite of the victories of Wallenstein in northern Germany, the Catholic League headed by Maximilian of Bavaria, who had entered the Thirty Years' War to crush the Protestants, was alarmed at the rising Imperial power, and at the Diet of Ratisbon in June demanded and obtained the deprivation of Wallenstein. At this Diet the influence of Father Joseph, the Cardinal's agent, was clearly manifest not only in Wallenstein's dismissal, but also in the failure of the Emperor Ferdinand to secure the election of his son as King of the Romans.

The loss of Wallenstein's services at this time was soon realized by the Emperor, for in July Gustavus Adolphus, to whom Richelieu had sent an envoy the previous year, landed in Germany while a large number of the Imperial troops were occupied in Italy. The Emperor, therefore, in October was willing to agree to the Treaty of Ratisbon, to settle the Mantuan succession, and to secure peace with France. A fortnight after the Treaty of Ratisbon had been signed (Richelieu refused to confirm it) a French army arrived before Casale, the town and castle being still in the hands of the Spaniards, and the citadel held by a French force. A conflict was averted by the appearance of Mazarin, who announced the conclusion of peace. In the following year the Treaty of Cherasco finally ended the so-called 'War of the Mantuan Succession'. The Duke (a Frenchman) recovered his duchy, and though French troops still held Pinerolo, the French army was withdrawn from Savoy and Piedmont.

The successful conclusion of the Italian question was mainly due to the arrival and successes of Gustavus Adolphus, for in the autumn of 1630 Richelieu was fully occupied with

domestic matters. In September Louis fell dangerously ill at Lyons, and intrigues by the Queen and Queen Mother for Richelieu's dismissal culminated in a violent scene between the Queen Mother and the Cardinal on November 10. The latter's fall was regarded as certain, and in consequence of the Queen Mother's actions and attitude the following day, November 11, 1630, was henceforward known as the 'day of dupes'. Two of Marie's adherents were punished. Marshal Louis de Marillac was executed, and his brother Michel de Marillac, the *Garde des Sceaux*, was exiled; Richelieu's triumph was undoubted, and henceforward his position was secure. Thus in 1631, the year which saw Richelieu a duke and peer found him triumphant over his domestic enemies and successful in his foreign policy. During the next four years Richelieu pursued a cautious policy—it was not till 1635 that war was declared upon Spain, and France definitely entered the Thirty Years' War.

During those years Gustavus Adolphus had won the battle of Breitenfeld (September 17, 1631), had advanced by Würzburg and Mainz to Bavaria, where in April 1632 he had defeated and killed Tilly in the battle of the Lech. But on November 16 he was himself killed in the battle of Lützen, though his army defeated that of Wallenstein, whom the Emperor had reappointed to the command. Until the internal troubles of France were over Richelieu was unwilling to make open war upon the Habsburgs, and besides, he hoped to separate the Catholic League from them. This hope was soon proved to be groundless, and moreover Oxenstierna, the Swedish Chancellor, who now headed a Protestant Alliance known as the League of Heilbronn (April 1633), adopted an independent attitude and declined to place in French hands Mainz and other places then in possession of Sweden. Anticipating Mazarin and

Napoleon, he endeavoured to establish a Rhenish Confederacy under French protection. In 1633 French troops occupied Lorraine, which in consequence of the Duke's refusal to do homage for it was declared forfeit by the *Parlement* of Paris; and at the end of 1634 the Duke of Orleans agreed to all Richelieu's demands and returned to France. It only remained to secure the co-operation of Sweden on Richelieu's terms. This was effected owing to the crushing defeat of Bernard of Saxe-Weimar and his Swedish army at Nördlingen on September 6, 1634. Oxenstierna at once agreed to the introduction of French garrisons into the Palatinate fortresses, and French troops occupied Ehrenbreitstein, Colmar, Philippsburg, Schlettstadt, and were supreme in the territories of the Bishop of Basel, and in the principality of Montbéliard. It only remained, before war with the Habsburgs had actually opened, to conclude a definite offensive and defensive alliance with Sweden and Holland. It was in February arranged with the Dutch Government that the Spanish Netherlands should be conquered and divided between France and Holland, and in April the French and Swedish Governments engaged to conclude no separate peace. On May 19, 1635 (the Imperialists having in January captured Philippsburg, and the Spaniards having in April seized Trier), France declared war upon Spain; in 1638 she declared war upon the Emperor.

The ensuing years, till Richelieu's death in 1642 and Louis XIII's death in 1643, are years of continual war, during which the French monarchy endeavoured to carry out the last schemes of Henry IV. The possessions and the allies of the House of Habsburg were attacked, one of the objects of Richelieu being to secure for France Alsace and Lorraine.

During these years the great Condé (Duc d'Enghien) and Turenne were trained, and after Richelieu's death they became prominent.

In this contest France was allied not only with Sweden and Holland but also with the Protestant League of Heilbronn, with Portugal, and with the Dukes of Modena, Parma, and Mantua (Treaty of Rivoli). It was not till after 1638 that any decided success was won, but between 1639 and 1641 Roussillon and the greater part of Catalonia were occupied; the fortresses in Alsace and the Breisgau, together with Artois, were conquered on the death of Bernard of Saxe-Weimar (July 1639), and successes of the French fleet in the Mediterranean were reported. Turin was taken by Harcourt in 1640, and Christina of Savoy was restored. Though no very startling success had attended the French arms, the Diet of the Empire at the close of 1641 declared itself in favour of negotiations, and it was settled that they should be opened at Münster and Osnabrück. During this period of continuous warfare Richelieu had difficulties at home. In December 1638 he lost his useful agent Father Joseph; in 1641 and 1642 he was threatened by plots, the one headed by the Count of Soissons, the other by Henry, Marquess of Cinq-Mars. The former was killed at the close of an engagement, the latter was seized and executed. At the close of his career Richelieu had certainly suppressed all danger of a Huguenot rising, and he had destroyed the possibility of the permanent preponderance in Europe of the Habsburgs. So occupied was he in making France predominant in Europe, that, even had he wished to do so, he had not the time to carry out great administrative reforms. It was not till the Revolution of 1789 that the financial reconstruction which was a crying necessity in the sixteenth century was

carried out. Equality of taxation was the chief reform required, and neither Richelieu, Mazarin, Louis XIV, nor Louis XV attempted to bring this about. 'If the Peace of Westphalia and the Peace of the Pyrenees were of his (Richelieu's) making, so also was the Revolution of 1789.' The birth of sons to Louis XIII in 1638 and 1640 had indeed removed many of his fears regarding the succession, but he did not live long enough to see the monarchy which he did so much to strengthen rise to its height under Louis XIV. He died on December 4, 1642.

On December 6, immediately after Richelieu's death, Louis XIII announced that Mazarin was now First Minister. But before Mazarin had established himself firmly in his new position Louis died on May 14, 1643, and the *Parlement* of Paris, following the example of the States-General on the accession of Charles VIII, appointed the weak Gaston of Orleans Lieutenant-General, and gave what was practically the supreme power to the Queen Mother, Anne of Austria, Louis XIV being then only four years old. The *Parlement*, aware of the weak, easy-going character of Anne, anticipated that Mazarin would be dismissed and the supreme power left in their hands. To their dismay Anne announced on May 18 that Mazarin would remain First Minister—a momentous decision implying that Richelieu's foreign policy of war against the Austro-Spanish House, and his domestic policy of consolidating the French monarchy, would continue. Consequently, till the coronation of Louis XIV at Rheims in 1654, an almost continuous struggle against Mazarin—beginning with *Les Importants* and continuing during the *Fronde*—was pursued by the nobles and the lawyer class with extraordinary bitterness and want of patriotism. For till the year of the Peace of Westphalia in 1648 the issue of

the war was doubtful, and it required all the energies of the new minister to bring it to a successful conclusion.

Mazarin therefore had difficult tasks before him, but in the end he succeeded in crushing the great nobles—a task begun by Richelieu—and by an astute and resolute foreign policy placed France in the forefront of the nations of Europe. He was undoubtedly an exceedingly clever man, but he cannot be acquitted of cunning, duplicity, and avarice. From 1643 to 1648 his chief object was to crush the House of Habsburg, and he was fortunate in finding in the Duc d'Enghien (son of Henry of Condé) and in Turenne two of the ablest generals of the day. On May 19, 1643, Enghien won the famous battle of Rocroi over the Spaniards—a success which encouraged Mazarin to arrest François de Vendôme, Duc de Beaufort, the leader of *Les Importants*, who desired an understanding with Spain as a preliminary to a general peace. In 1644 Turenne and Enghien, by their victory at Freiburg, secured a hold on the Rhine Valley, though in his attempt to march on Vienna Turenne was, on May 5, 1645, defeated at Mergentheim. However, with the help of Enghien and a number of fresh troops, Turenne was able to win a brilliant victory at Nördlingen on August 3. As Ragotsky, Prince of Transylvania, and the Swedish General Torstenson, who were operating on the eastern German border, had retreated, Turenne was unable to advance on Vienna. In 1646, though the French received a check at Orbitello, they won several successes in the Netherlands, capturing Courtrai, Mardyke, Furnes, and Dunkirk, while by diplomacy Mazarin firmly established French influence in Poland, Sweden, and Denmark. The only unsatisfactory feature in the situation was the increasing hostility of the nobles, such as Henry of Condé (who died in December), towards Mazarin; and in

this attitude they were supported by Enghien. The latter, after the fall of Dunkirk, carried on a campaign in Spain, while Turenne in conjunction with a Swedish army compelled Duke Maximilian of Bavaria to agree to the Treaty of Ulm in March 1647. Mazarin was thus able to concentrate his efforts in the Spanish Netherlands.

Nevertheless, when 1648 opened there seemed little chance of the conclusion of the war during that year. In January the Dutch made a treaty with Spain, and the Elector of Bavaria, who had renounced the Treaty of Ulm, was again in arms. Energetic measures were at once taken by Mazarin and his generals. In May a combined Franco-Swedish army won the battle of Zusmarshausen and invaded Bavaria, while another Swedish army menaced Prague. On July 13 Schomberg captured Tortosa, thus threatening Spain with invasion, while a fortnight later a Swedish army seized Little Prague, and on August 22 Condé won a brilliant victory over the Spaniards at Lens. Owing to this succession of defeats the Emperor was now willing to treat, while Mazarin, seriously hampered by the outbreak in August of the *Fronde* in Paris, met him in a conciliatory spirit. On October 24, 1648, the Peace of Westphalia was signed.

The Emperor Ferdinand II had, before his death in 1637, hoped to detach the Swedes from their alliance with France, but his son, the Emperor Ferdinand III, while anxious for peace, refused to recognize the position of the Protestant Estates. In 1643 and 1644 he became more amenable, and in 1645 a congress was opened at Münster and Osnabrück; but the Peace of Westphalia (signed at Münster and Osnabrück) was not actually concluded till October 27, 1648. The sovereignty of France over the three bishoprics of Metz, Toul, and Verdun was recognized; as was the

French sovereignty over Pinerolo. For the time being Lorraine was to remain in French hands, as its Duke had not come to terms with the King of France. The clauses in the treaty relating to Alsace were on many points obscure. The whole of Alsace and its Estates were, however, not subject to Austria as Mazarin supposed. The King of France obtained practical possession of the greater part of Upper and Lower Alsace, together with the fortress of Breisach, and while he 'undertook to respect the liberties and immediacy to the Empire not only of the Bishops of Strassburg and Basel, but also of the other immediate Estates in both Upper and Lower Alsace, including the Ten Free Towns, he did so on condition that the rights of his sovereignty should not suffer from this reservation'.¹

Louis XIV did not hesitate to take full advantage of the obscurity of the clauses relating to Alsace, and in 1681 he occupied the town of Strassburg. Perhaps the chief advantage of the war and the Treaty of Westphalia to France was that they 'enormously increased her moral ascendancy in Western Germany and in the Empire at large'.² The power of the House of Austria was proportionately lessened, and the religious, territorial, and civil independence of the various minor states was recognized.

Peace having been signed with Austria and satisfactory concessions having been made to Sweden by the Emperor, it remained for Mazarin to bring the war with Spain to a close. In his efforts to effect this object he was seriously hampered by the unpatriotic conduct of the *Frondeurs*.

At the moment when the Peace of Westphalia had been signed Mazarin and the Court were at Rueil, whither they had

¹ *Cambridge Modern History*, vol. iv, p. 406.

² *Ibid.*, p. 416.

withdrawn on September 13, to return to Paris on October 30, six days after the conclusion of the war with the Emperor. Regardless of the situation abroad, the *Parlement* of Paris since the opening of the year had been occupied in resisting the Crown. Ever since his accession to office Mazarin had been opposed by the factious nobility, and since 1645 by the growing antagonism of the *Parlement* of Paris. Richelieu had left the finances of France in a desperate condition. Like Mazarin, he had no aptitude for finance—which was an especially serious matter during the great war then being waged. Like Charles I, Mazarin fell back upon a lapsed edict—which forbade the erection of houses within a certain distance outside Paris—and allowed Particelli d'Émery, the Controller-General of Finance, to attempt its enforcement. That edict had, however, in 1644 to be withdrawn, owing to the opposition of the *Parlement* of Paris and the riots which were taking place in some of the provinces. Other schemes were proposed, but, even when put into force, failed to relieve the situation. Mazarin never seems to have realized the miserable condition of the poorer classes. But Omer Talon, at the *Lit de Justice* held in January 1648, described it in a speech in which he declared that since 1638 the country had been ruined. In order to secure a better state of things a revolution was necessary. But it was impossible at that time to find men capable of establishing a new Constitution. The States-General in 1614 had proved singularly ineffective; the incapacity and short-sightedness of the nobles baffled description; while the *Parlement* of Paris, which posed as a sort of English Parliament, could never shake itself free from its narrow selfish ambitions and struggle for the rights of the people. Omer Talon might describe the utter misery of a large portion of the nation, but when it came to action the *Parlement* fought

only to maintain its own privileges. Like Mazarin, it cared nothing for the internal welfare of the country.

In 1648, before the war with Austria had been closed by the Peace of Westphalia, the First Parliamentary *Fronde* broke out. Its outbreak was due immediately to the struggle between the *Parlement* of Paris and the Crown in the earlier months of the year. On May 15 delegates of the four sovereign Courts—the *Parlement*, the *Grand Conseil*, the *Chambre des Comptes*, and the *Cour des Aides*—met in the Chamber of St. Louis 'to reform the abuses which had crept into the State'. Their demands amounted to a large share in the government of the country; but in asking for the abolition of that useful class, the *Intendants*, they showed the inability of a close corporation of lawyers to act in a statesmanlike manner. The Court was emboldened by the opportune victory of Lens on August 20, and the Government at once ordered the arrest of three of the leaders of the *Parlement*—Broussel, Blancmesnil, and Charton. Charton escaped, but the other two leaders of the *Parlement* were seized. A situation somewhat similar to that of July 1830 was as suddenly created. Barricades were set up, and Paris was in a state of revolution, among its leaders being Paul de Gondi (afterwards Cardinal de Retz). After a short interval Broussel—the popular hero—and Blancmesnil were released. For the time the *Parlement* had conquered, and after a short withdrawal on September 13 to Rueil, Mazarin and the Court returned to Paris (October 30). As the attitude of the Parisians continued hostile to Mazarin the Court, on January 6, 1649, returned to Saint-Germain-en-Laye, and the war of the First *Fronde* broke out, continuing till April 1. This war was concentrated round Paris, the royalist troops being under the efficient command of Condé. In Paris the mob, anticipating July 14, 1789, seized on January 12 the

Bastille, and gained a few successes. But Condé's army, like that of the Germans in 1871, gradually wore down the resistance of the Parisians, and at the beginning of April the Treaty of Rueil ended the war of the First *Fronde*, during which Turenne had joined the opposition to the Court.

Peace only continued till January 1650, for the *Frondeurs* remained dissatisfied with the terms of the Treaty. The *Parlement* gained some recognition of its right to take part in State affairs, but the chief desire of the *Frondeurs*—the exile of Mazarin—was not complied with.

Though the war was closed it was not till August that the Court, which had moved to Compiègne, returned to Paris. Nevertheless, the situation was an anxious one. Condé, to whom was due the overthrow of the First *Fronde*, which indeed affected to desire serious and important reforms, was not satisfied with his position, and a breach soon took place between him and the Court. During the later months of 1649 the party of the New *Fronde* was forming. Its members had no political or constitutional aims: their object was to overthrow Mazarin and to secure power for themselves. One of the characteristics of the New *Fronde* was the conspicuous part taken by women. 'Women', writes Lavallée, 'played throughout this time the most splendid part, which brought out all their cleverness: theirs was a life of adventure and romance, crowded with pleasures and perils; they took the lead alike in love affairs or warlike expeditions, in fêtes or conspiracies.' The actual movement known as the New *Fronde* definitely began when, on January 10, 1650, Mazarin arrested Condé, Conti, his brother-in-law, and Longueville. Mazarin's position seemed strong, for he had for the moment gained over de Retz and Madame de Chevreuse; in the spring he made with Louis a successful tour in the provinces,

and on December 13 the royal army defeated Turenne at Rethel.

Arriving in Paris on December 31, 1650, Mazarin found the capital seething with intrigue, and de Retz his avowed enemy. The *Parlement* declared itself in favour of the three imprisoned princes. The two *Frondes* united. Anne of Austria was too ill to leave Paris. Ought Mazarin, by force of arms, to have suppressed the factions in Paris? He decided otherwise, and on February 6, 1651, left Paris, and from April 11 to the end of October resided at Brühl. During the year important events took place: Louis XIV attained his majority, and Condé entered into relations with Spain, thus severing his connexion with the *Parlement* of Paris, which body in December 1651 attainted him of high treason. In the following year—a year of battles—Turenne, who had returned to his allegiance to the French King, won the battles of Jargeau on March 29, and Étampes on May 4, and gave battle to Condé in the Faubourg St. Antoine on July 2. After a period of great confusion in Paris, during which Condé was supreme, a reaction in favour of the King took place. Mazarin had wisely left France a second time, and in October Condé retired from the capital, which on October 21 was entered by the King amid scenes of great enthusiasm. As far as Paris was concerned the period of the *Frondes* was over, and on February 3, 1653, Mazarin returned to Paris; in July, with the submission of Bordeaux, the Provincial *Fronde* came to an end.

Foreign affairs demanded his immediate and exclusive attention; for owing to the unpatriotic action of Condé and the *Frondeurs* the Spaniards had gained several successes, and in the spring of 1652 were threatening Dunkirk. Even at this anxious time Mazarin could not decide to accept

Cromwell's offers of assistance; and while he hesitated Blake with a declaration of war seized all the French vessels, except one, in the neighbourhood of Dunkirk, which place on the following day (September 16) surrendered to the Spaniards. Realizing, when too late, the blunder that he had made, he acknowledged the English Commonwealth in December. A powerful ally was, indeed, an urgent necessity, for since 1648 France had lost Casale, Catalonia, Dunkirk, Mardyke, Gravelines, and Furnes. From the beginning of 1653 matters gradually improved. In 1654 Alsace, Philippsburg, and the Rhine frontier were secured; and in November 1653 a commercial treaty was concluded with England which paved the way for the Treaty of Paris in March 1657. By that treaty Cromwell engaged to aid France with 6,000 men, on condition that Dunkirk and Mardyke should be ceded to England. The following year the battle of the Dunes was fought, the Spaniards were defeated, and Dunkirk and Gravelines captured. The same year Lionne built up the League of the Rhine, which was a serious menace to the power of the new Emperor Leopold I, who was elected in July. Moreover, Spain was now a defeated Power, for after the capture of Dunkirk and Gravelines Turenne had overrun Flanders, while wars with Portugal and England had broken out and as early as 1655 Jamaica had been lost. On November 7, 1659, the Peace of the Pyrenees was signed. It was agreed that Louis XIV should marry the Spanish Infanta, who on the payment of 500,000 crowns as a dowry by Philip was to renounce her claims on the Spanish throne; and that France should be put into possession of Roussillon, Cerdagne, Artois, and a number of towns which strengthened the position of France on the side of the Low Countries. Spain secured Franche-Comté and the Spanish Marches, recovered some

towns in the Netherlands, and secured pardon for the traitor Condé.

The Peace of the Pyrenees had thus tranquillised central and western Europe. In the north, however, owing to the ambition of Charles X of Sweden, war continued to reign, and during the greater part of the year 1659 there seemed little chance of the restoration of peace. Owing to the firm language of Mazarin, followed on February 23, 1660, by the somewhat opportune death of Charles X, a general pacification was effected. The Treaties of Oliva and Copenhagen closed the war of Sweden with Poland and Denmark; by the Treaty of Kardis, in July 1661, Russia and Sweden were reconciled. Thus peace was restored in northern as well as in central and western Europe. Before this condition of things was firmly established Mazarin had died on March 9, 1661, leaving an enormous fortune.

Mazarin had, indeed, regained for France a high position in Europe, and had suppressed rebellion. But the Peace of the Pyrenees found the condition of the country pitiable in the extreme—the natural result of a long period of civil war, and consequent heavy taxation. The brightest feature of the period was the rise of Jansenism at the monastery of Port-Royal in Paris about the year 1643, and the publication some years later of Pascal's *Lettres Provinciales*. But with the accession of Louis XIV this movement was severely checked, only to resume a position of great importance in the reigns of Louis XV and XVI.

The Age of Louis XIV

THE period from the death of Mazarin in 1661 to that of Louis XIV in 1715 saw the French monarchy at its height. Its literature was the superior of that of any other nation, as is shown by the orations and writings of such men as Bossuet and Fénelon; its artists and architects were unrivalled. In the subjects of mathematics, music, astronomy, chemistry, and, in fact, in all matters relating to natural science, France held the foremost place in Europe. Moreover, in matters diplomatic she was unrivalled; such diplomats, formed in the school of Richelieu and Mazarin, as Hugues de Lionne, Arnauld de Pomponne, and Colbert de Croissy showed extraordinary skill in their profession. The same can be said of her statesmen and generals. Colbert was unequalled in the ability and foresight with which he administered France and encouraged the growth of colonies, while the value of the work of Michel le Tellier, Louvois, and Vauban in reorganizing the army was clearly manifest throughout the years from 1661. The navy also became a worthy rival of that of England during the greater part of the reign. It was a period when the absolute monarchy was established on a permanent basis, and the government of the country was centralized in Paris. No attempt was made to summon the States-General and the *Parlement* of Paris, and the provincial *Parlements*, which had shown such activity during Louis XIV's minority, were reduced to complete political powerlessness, and became simply law courts. After 1665 their title of Sovereign Law Courts was changed to that of Superior Courts.

Louis XIV, who was twenty-two years old, entered upon his duties on the death of Mazarin on March 9, 1661. He stated plainly his intentions at the first council held after the minister's death, at which were present: Fouquet, the *Surintendant*; Le Tellier, the Minister of War; Lionne; and the Chancellor Séguier. He would be his own First Minister, and nothing was to be signed without his orders. The Archbishop of Rouen received a similar intimation. Louis was to be the real head of Church and State in France. The reign of Richelieu was to be continued and developed, and no opposition from princes, the *Parlement*, or the Huguenots would be tolerated. In 1667 the *Parlement* lost its right of remonstrance and till Louis' death was silenced. Condé had to make abject submission before he was restored to his rank and property. France was in a position somewhat similar to that of England after the Wars of the Roses. The nation was weary of party struggle, and Louis XIV was welcomed, like Henry VII, as a restorer of peace and of order.

One of Louis' first acts was to replace Fouquet, the *Surintendant des Finances*, by Colbert. Nicholas Fouquet had held the office since 1653, and had accumulated a vast fortune. Convinced of his dishonesty, Louis had him arrested on September 5, 1661, and kept him in imprisonment till his death at Pignerol in 1680. Ten days after Fouquet's fall Colbert entered the *Conseil des Finances*; in 1665 he became *Contrôleur Général des Finances* and Secretary of State for the King's Household; in 1669 he had charge of the Navy. From 1661 to the day of his death he never ceased carrying out financial reforms, colonial schemes, and projects for the improvement of agriculture and industry. He improved the means of communication in France; he established commer-

cial companies. Madagascar became the principal centre of the *Compagnie des Indes Orientales*, and Havre that of the *Compagnie des Indes Occidentales*, which traded chiefly with Canada, Western Africa, the Antilles, and Cayenne. Both were established in 1664. Numerous other trading companies were formed, many of which had short careers. Marseilles, Dunkirk, Bayonne were established as ports for the encouragement of trade, and a large merchant service was created. To watch over trade Colbert, in 1664, resuscitated the *Conseil de Commerce* which Henry IV had founded, and in 1673 he published his *Ordonnance de Commerce* which described fully the commercial and industrial situation and gathered into one code the many provincial customs dealing with trade. He was a firm believer in the 'mercantile system', and placed restrictions on the importation of goods from foreign countries.

In 1675 the peasants in Brittany, following the example of those in Guienne, Vivarais, Pyrenees, and Bourbonnais, rose in a rebellion, which coincided in point of time with Colbert's realization that his work was likely to be ruined by the pomp of Versailles and the wars in Flanders. For since the beginning of his personal rule in 1661 Louis XIV had been bent on securing fame by conquest, which could only result from expensive wars. Till the outbreak of the War of Devolution in 1667 he strengthened the position of France in various ways—he bought Dunkirk from England, he secured the submission of the Papacy, he aided the Imperialists to defeat the Turks in the battle of St. Gotthard, he made treaties with Sweden, Denmark, Brandenburg, Saxony, and Mainz, and, by renewing the League of the Rhine, he held the Emperor in check. Moreover, a French force aided the Portuguese to win the victory of Villaviciosa and to secure its indepen-

dence. In 1665 Philip IV of Spain died, and was succeeded by Charles II, whose health was so uncertain that the question of the Spanish succession was before the minds of European statesmen till the close of the century. On the death of Philip, Louis at once claimed Flanders in right of his wife Marie Thérèse, in accordance with 'a civil claim of inheritance prevailing in Brabant' called the *ius devolutionis*.

Owing to the Anglo-Dutch War in the years 1665-7, in which he nominally aided the Dutch, Louis did not enter upon the War of Devolution till May 1667. From that date till the English Revolution of 1688 his foreign policy was, on the whole, successful. It was of a most aggressive character, but only gradually roused the opposition of the greater part of Europe. In 1667 the French arms won rapid successes in Flanders, and on January 20, 1668, Louis' claim to the Spanish succession in the event of the King of Spain's death without heirs was recognized by the Emperor Leopold in a secret treaty. Though England, Holland, and Sweden were drawing together, owing to their alarm at Louis' successes, and formed in January 1668 the Triple Alliance, French troops occupied Burgundy and Franche-Comté. As a result of the hostile attitude of the Triple Alliance, Louis, on the advice of Colbert and Lionne, agreed by the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle, in May, to withdraw from Franche-Comté, though he remained in possession of twelve fortresses with their districts in the Spanish Netherlands. He was, however, determined to secure the whole of Flanders, and as a means to that end resolved to conquer Holland, his pride being moreover wounded at the daring opposition of a republic—and indeed a Protestant one. Louvois, too, pointed out that the surest way to the acquisition of the Spanish Netherlands was through Holland. Louis therefore set to work to isolate

the Republic. In preparation for the annihilation of Holland Colbert prepared the finances, Louvois organized the army, and Lionne arranged for alliances. The neutrality of Charles II was secured by the secret Treaty of Dover in 1670; the Emperor Leopold had lately made the Secret Treaty of 1668; the neutrality of Brandenburg was assured by a treaty in 1669, and that of the Elector of Bavaria, whose daughter was to marry the Dauphin, in 1670.

In April 1672 Sweden engaged, in concert with Denmark, to close the Baltic to the Dutch fleet. In June the French army crossed the Rhine and occupied the greater part of Holland. But the Dutch nation, maddened at Louis' extravagant demands, assassinated John de Witt and his brother and opened the dikes, while William of Orange was made Stadtholder. Early in 1673, after the failure of Luxemburg to seize Amsterdam, the French army retired. In that year Louis found himself engaged in a war with a coalition of European Powers which included the Emperor, the Great Elector (Frederick William of Brandenburg), the Kings of Spain and Denmark, and the Dukes of Brunswick and Hesse. In England there was an urgent demand for a declaration of war against France. For five years France fought with no little success against the greater part of Europe, during which (on January 27, 1675) Turenne was killed; the Swedes, the allies of France, were defeated at Fehrbellin by the Great Elector, and William of Orange married Mary, the daughter of James Duke of York.

In 1678 Louis fully realized that, in spite of the efforts of Turenne and Condé on land and of Duquesne at sea, peace was desirable. The cost of the war had been immense; risings had taken place in Normandy, Brittany, and Guienne; England was daily becoming more and more hostile. Con-

sequently negotiations were opened, and by the Peace of Nimeguen France gained fresh acquisitions, such as Franche-Comté, which strengthened the French eastern frontier. With the Emperor a treaty was made in February 1679 by which Louis, on giving up his right to garrison Philippsburg, gained Old Breisach and Freiburg. Lorraine remained garrisoned by French troops, as the Duke refused the French terms. Louis was now at the height of his power. Never had France appeared so strong. Holland was, however, for the time secure, and so far Louis' triumph was incomplete. The Peace of Nimeguen proved to be only a truce.

Nevertheless, though Spain was in a state of decadence and practically disarmed, and though the Emperor's attention was fully occupied with troubles in Hungary, and he was moreover threatened by the resurrection of Turkey, Louis XIV's position contained elements of danger. The English nation's suspicions, if not actual hostility, had been roused, and the attitude of the German princes was far from friendly. Nevertheless, to the French nation their country had never seemed stronger or in a more glorious position. Louis, perhaps naturally, ignored all signs of future trouble, and allowed himself to be carried away by pride. The *Chambres de Réunion* were set up in order to secure 'those lands which were not actually dependent upon his new conquests, but which had formerly been so'. At Metz in October 1679 the first *Chambre de Réunion* was set up, and similar *Chambres* were fixed at Tournai, Besançon, and Breisach. In August 1680 Upper and Lower Alsace were claimed; on September 30, 1681, French troops occupied Strassburg and Casale; and in November the siege of Luxemburg began. Owing, however, to the opposition in Holland and England to the prospect of French supremacy in Luxemburg Louis consented to with-

draw his troops, nominally in order not to hamper the German preparations to resist the coming Turkish invasion.

The year 1682 is specially noteworthy in the history of France, as it saw Louis' attempt to secure the independence of the Gallican Church; it also saw the steady increase of the general uneasiness in Europe at his unceasing activity in foreign affairs. In September 1683 the Turks, who had besieged Vienna, were driven back by John Sobieski and his Polish army, to the great relief of Europe. Before the end of the year the King of Spain declared war upon Louis, who captured Luxemburg in June 1684. As the Emperor and Empire, then at war with Turkey, could not resist Louis, the Truce of Ratisbon, on August 15, was agreed upon, by which Louis was for twenty years to hold not only Strassburg but all the places assigned to him before August 1, 1681, by the *Chambres de Réunion*.

Louis' position seemed now stronger than ever, and he therefore determined to accept the advice of Madame de Maintenon, whom he had married in 1684, and other extreme Roman Catholics, and to revoke on October 22, 1685, the Edict of Nantes, an action which had deplorable results, commercial and political, upon France. With the establishment of religious uniformity France became a Power 'uniform in its nationality and ecclesiastical system, with well-defined frontiers, admirably armed for offence and defence, both by sea and land'. No greater blow could have been inflicted on France. In 1688 Louis had lost 600 officers and 12,000 soldiers—all of whom had emigrated.¹ From 1685

¹ During the War of the Spanish Succession Louis paid the penalty for his revocation of the Edict of Nantes, for between 1703 and 1711 the Camisards of the Cevennes occupied the attention of a large royal army.

the European storm began to gather, and Louis would probably have acted wisely had he forced on the inevitable war in that year. As it was, between 1685 and 1689 many events took place which were detrimental to Louis' interests. The Great Elector in 1685 allied himself with William of Orange, and on July 6, 1686, the Augsburg Alliance, to preserve the Treaties of Westphalia and Nimeguen and the Truce of Ratisbon, was formed, and among its members were the Emperor, the Kings of Spain and Sweden, the Dutch Republic, the Elector Palatine, Saxony, and the Circles of Bavaria, Franconia, and the Upper Rhine. The immediate cause of the formation of the League was anxiety with regard to the Palatinate, and the League was so greatly strengthened by the successes of the Imperialists against the Turks in 1686 and the following years, that Louis decided that it would be unwise to postpone hostilities any longer. The signal for war was given when Louis, in 1688, occupied Cologne in order to establish the claims of William von Fürstenberg to the archbishopric, and to retain the control of that important district. At the same time the claim which he put forward on behalf of the Duchess of Orleans to the Palatinate was used as another reason for invading Germany. On October 29 the French troops occupied Philippsburg, and on that day William of Orange, taking advantage of Louis' blunder in not attacking Holland, sailed for England. The war which had thus opened continued till the Peace of Ryswick in 1697; and in May 1689 the League of Augsburg became the Grand Alliance, which William III definitely joined in December.

Louis was now opposed not only by the Emperor, England, Brandenburg, and Bavaria, but also by the Empire, which in consequence of the devastation of the Palatinate declared

war in February 1689. He seems to have realized that in England, which now entered upon the second Hundred Years' War with France, he was to meet a dangerous foe. For the conquest of Belgium and Holland it was necessary to overthrow William III. In 1689 and 1690 James II was in Ireland with 2,000 French troops, but on July 11, 1690, the hopes of Louis and James were destroyed by the battle of the Boyne, and James returned to France. And though the French fleet won the battle of Beachy Head on July 10, 1690, it suffered a severe defeat in the battle of La Hogue on May 29, 1692. England was now secure from invasion, and the restoration of James II was more unlikely than ever. So confident had Louis been before the battle of La Hogue took place that, like Napoleon in 1803 and 1804, he had prepared a large army which was to be transported across the Channel for the conquest of England. Russell, however, by his victory at La Hogue, anticipated Nelson's victory at Trafalgar. Foiled, Louis, like Napoleon, concentrated all his energies on the war on the Continent. In Italy Catinat had, in 1690, defeated Amadeus of Savoy in the battle of Staffarda; in 1691 the French took Mons, in 1692 Namur; they also defeated William III in the battle of Steenkerke, while Catinat, after his victory at Marsaglia, invaded Piedmont.

At the opening of 1694 it seemed that French supremacy in the Mediterranean, which had been uncontested since the withdrawal of English troops from Tangier in 1684, was assured, and that Louis would be able to reinforce his armies in Flanders and on the Rhine by troops from the south of Italy. The situation was, however, saved by the arrival of Russell and a fleet in the Mediterranean in the summer of 1694. Though Russell was unable to bring about a decisive

battle with the French fleet, his presence in the Mediterranean till 1696 interfered with the freedom of Louis' operations in northern Europe. Nevertheless, the defection of the Duke of Savoy, in August 1696, to the French cause, and the neutralization of Italy, were of great advantage to Louis. Though William III in August 1695 had recaptured Namur, thus for the first time in the war inflicting a severe defeat on the French, the prospect of the arrival of Catinat with some 30,000 troops from Italy inclined him to receive favourably overtures for peace from Louis, who was quite ready to make them, as not only were the resources of France exhausted, but it was now evident that Charles II of Spain was nearing his end. Louis desired to see the coalition against him dissolved before his death, in order to prevent the intervention of Europe in his schemes.

In the autumn of 1697 the Treaties of Ryswick ended the war. Louis recognized William III as King of England, and recovered Nova Scotia from England and Pondicherry from Holland, at the same time lowering the tariff to the level of 1664; Lorraine was restored to its Duke, but Louis kept Strassburg and Landau, restoring all the places which had been 'reunited' to France since 1678. What was probably not realized either in France or England was that the Peace of Ryswick was merely a truce in the struggle between them for colonies in North America. The growing importance of commerce, and hence the increased value set upon colonial possessions, had become more and more evident in each decade of the century. Louis had rejected the proposal of Leibnitz that he should occupy Egypt. He did, indeed, receive an embassy from Siam, but he was too much interested in projects of conquest to devote much attention to colonial matters, much to the despair of Colbert. Neverthe-

less, the colonial question continued steadily to increase in importance. Its importance had already been emphasized by Cromwell when he decided to attack Spain and not France, because the former refused to give up its monopoly of trade in the West Indies and South America.

Henry IV was interested in colonial matters ; during the later years of his reign French colonies in Canada were formed, and the era of colonial expansion, the natural sequel to the period of the great discoveries, was opened. Between 1604 and 1608 two Frenchmen from Saintonge—de Monts and Champlain—colonized Quebec and the peninsula of Acadia. Richelieu continued his policy, and the Company of Canada was formed in 1628. To it was granted the city of Quebec and all of New France called Canada. Another company was also organized by Richelieu, called the Bank of St. Peter with the Fleur de Lys, for the purpose of trade in Canada, and to encourage the company it was stated that the right of nobility was to be given to thirty-two members of the Company and ‘ to those whose ancestors had been constantly in its service ’ for three generations, ‘ the intention of His Majesty being to grant more honour than heretofore to those who embrace commerce ’.¹ Though there was some development of French interests in the colonies, the results in Canada were not of any importance till Louis XIV’s reign, when Colbert took steps to increase its population and to improve its trade. He had early realized the advantages to be derived from settlements in new lands, and in 1664 had formed a West India Company, which, however, only existed for ten years. The French colonies were ruled by the Minister of the Marine ; and a Governor and an *Intendant* managed their internal administration. Canada,

¹ Perkins, *France under Richelieu and Mazarin*, vol. ii, pp. 112-13.

where the Jesuits were hard at work among the Indians, was in 1662 placed under a Governor and a Council nominated by the King, and entered upon a period of prosperity. About 1685 the encroachment of the French settlers on New England began, and before the century closed a French settlement was formed at the mouth of the Mississippi, extending from the mouth of that river to Canada. Consequently, from 1689 to 1815, in every war between France and England the colonial question bulks large. The Treaty of Ryswick was merely a truce both from the European as well as from the colonial point of view.

The Spanish Succession War was preceded by four years of useless diplomacy over the coming partition of Spain, which was regarded as a certain event upon the death of Charles II. Hence the First and Second Partition Treaties were drawn up—the first in 1698, and the second in 1700. According to the latter the Archduke Charles, the second son of the Emperor Leopold, was to have Spain, the Spanish Netherlands, and the Spanish possessions in South America, while the Dauphin was to have the Two Sicilies, the Tuscan ports, Finale, Guipuzcoa, and the Milanese (to be exchanged for Lorraine), thus enabling France to strengthen her position, if not to become supreme, in the Mediterranean.

These arrangements came to nothing, as Charles II of Spain made a will on October 11, 1700, leaving the Spanish monarchy to Philip, Duke of Anjou, the second son of the Dauphin. Charles died on November 1, 1700, and Louis accepted the bequest. English public opinion compelled William also, much to his displeasure, to accept it, and the peace of Europe might have been preserved had not Louis, convinced that hostilities were inevitable, committed acts which brought about the Spanish Succession War. He

refused to give an undertaking that Philip V should under no circumstances inherit the crown of France, in addition to that of Spain ; his troops occupied the Barrier fortresses of the Netherlands in February 1701 ; and on the death of James II on September 14 he recognized his son James Edward as James III, King of England.

Meanwhile William III, the Emperor, and the States-General had practically formed the Grand Alliance on September 7, and on William's return to England he found the nation unanimous for war. Though William died on March 8, 1702, his policy had triumphed, and on May 4 war was declared by the English Government against France and Spain. The war had the ostensible object of preventing the possible union of France and Spain, and of forcing Louis to restore the Barrier fortresses. It had also the object of obtaining a guarantee from the King of Spain that the commercial privileges of England and Holland should not suffer. Further, the Allies were resolved to conquer Milan, Sicily, and Naples for the Emperor, by way of securing the commerce of the English and Dutch nations. It is thus evident that the objects of the members of the Grand Alliance were commercial as well as political. France was at all hazards to be prevented from entering into the monopoly of the New World and closing it to England and Holland.

Already, in 1701, hostilities had broken out in Italy and both Catinat and Villeroi had been defeated, and in the following February (1702) Prince Eugène had followed up his successes by capturing Villeroi in Cremona. In March the general European war opened. A considerable number of the German princes fought against Louis, who, however, had the support of Maximilian Emmanuel, Elector of Bavaria, and Joseph Clement (a Wittelsbach), the Archbishop Elector

of Cologne. Portugal, through fear of Spain, was the ally of Louis, and so too was Savoy, whose alliance could not be regarded as of much value. Till the battle of Blenheim in 1704 the French losses were fairly well balanced by successes. Thus, in October 1702 Villars defeated the Imperialists at Friedlingen, while in the same month Boufflers suffered a reverse in the Netherlands, and in Vigo Bay the Spanish galleons were destroyed and the combined French and Spanish fleets were defeated. In 1703 the alliance of France with Bavaria enabled Villars to plan a march on Vienna which would probably, if undertaken, have been successful. For Hungary was in revolt and Marlborough was fully occupied in the Netherlands. Fortunately for the Emperor, Maximilian of Bavaria was intent upon operations in the Tyrol, and the chance was lost, one result being that Villars quarrelled violently with Maximilian and was recalled. Before the famous march on Vienna in 1704 had been undertaken, France had lost the alliance with Savoy, which had joined the Emperor, thus rendering a French attack on Austria, such as was carried out by Napoleon in 1796 and 1797, impossible. Nevertheless, Tallard, full of confidence, began his march. On August 13, however, he suffered a disastrous defeat at Blenheim, from Marlborough and Prince Eugène—Vienna was saved, Bavaria was overrun, and its Elector escaped to France.

Meanwhile Portugal had joined the Allies, and nine days before Blenheim Gibraltar had been taken by Rooke. With Portugal as a base, the Allies were now able to invade Spain, the government of which was, in 1705, directed by Amelot, the French envoy, and the Princesse des Ursins. In March 1706 the French army under Villeroi suffered a disastrous defeat at Ramillies, with the result that all Brabant, most of Flanders,

and Ostend fell into Marlborough's hands. Moreover, in August the battle of Turin was followed by the expulsion of the French from Piedmont. In 1707 Louis wisely resolved to evacuate Italy, with the exception of Savoy and Nice, and in March the Convention of Milan secured North Italy for the Allies. Louis was now able to concentrate all his forces in Spain, Flanders, and on the Rhine. The results of the year 1706 had been so satisfactory for the Allies, that Louis had, in October, made overtures for peace. But the English ministers would not accept his proposal for a partition of the Spanish monarchy, and were supported by the Emperor. Louis, however, had his revenge, for the year 1707 was disastrous to the Allies, though Marlborough was reassured as to the designs of Charles XII of Sweden. Nevertheless, the death of Louis of Baden in January 1707, the failure of the invasion of Provence by Eugène and Victor Amadeus, and the defeat of the Allies at Almanza, which battle assured the throne of Spain to the Bourbons—all these events were in striking contrast to the successes of 1706. Nevertheless, in December 1707 the House of Lords decided that no peace could be honourable or safe which allowed the House of Bourbon to retain any part of the Spanish monarchy, and the events of the following year seemed to justify their confidence.

For in 1708 an expedition to Scotland in favour of James Edward ended in failure, and the battle of Oudenarde, fought on July 11, resulted in the submission of the whole of Flanders to the Allies, and in the capture in December of the citadel of Lille after a brilliant defence by Boufflers. It was not surprising, therefore, that proposals of peace were laid before Marlborough at The Hague by Torcy, the French Agent in Holland. While willing to make considerable concessions,

Louis refused to aid the Allies in compelling Philip to renounce the Spanish crown. The war therefore continued. Louis made a stirring appeal to the patriotism of the French nation, and on September 11, 1709, the famous battle of Malplaquet was fought. Though it was lost by Villars, his 'army could fairly claim to have shared the honours' with their opponents. In February 1710 negotiations were opened at Gertruydenberg, but again failed, as Philip would not agree to the proposals of the Allies. He was justified, for before the end of the year the Allies were defeated at Brihuega (December 10) and at Villaviciosa (December 20), and Philip's position was assured. Meanwhile, the Whig Government in England had been replaced by the Tories under Harley and St. John, who before many months were over showed a readiness to enter upon negotiations. The Archduke Charles succeeded to the Austrian throne early in 1711, and it was then obviously impossible for the Allies to desire the restoration of the Habsburg Empire of Charles V.

Negotiations were at once set on foot, and in October preliminaries of peace were drawn up; but none the less hostilities continued through the year 1711, and Marlborough took Bouchain on September 13. Before, however, he could advance into France he was recalled, and on December 31 dismissed from all his employments. On January 1, 1712, the Congress of Utrecht was opened, though no armistice was arranged, and on July 24 Villars defeated the Dutch at Denain, and raised the prestige of the French arms by his capture of Quesnoy and Bouchain. In July Philip V consented to renounce his claim on the French throne, and in April 1713 the Peace of Utrecht was signed. It consisted of a number of treaties. To Great Britain France gave Newfoundland, Acadia, and Hudson's Bay, recognized the

Protestant Succession in England, and promised to dismantle Dunkirk. Her share in the fisheries north of Cape Bonavista and her right to cure fish on the shore of Newfoundland were allowed, and Cape Breton Island and the other islands at the mouth of the St. Lawrence were ceded to her.

It was also settled that the Spanish Netherlands should be given to Austria; that a Barrier should be set up between France and the United Netherlands; and that France should receive certain towns. France not only made peace with Great Britain and Holland: she also signed treaties with Prussia, Savoy, and Portugal. From Spain Great Britain obtained Gibraltar, Minorca, and the *Assiento* (a contract which gave England the monopoly of supplying the Spanish colonies in America with negro slaves); and, most important of all, the renunciation by Philip of his claims, and those of his successors, to the throne of France. The real cause of the war had been the danger of the union of the crowns of Spain and France. The Emperor, however, refused to make peace till March 6, 1714, when the Treaty of Rastadt closed the war between Austria and France; while in September the Treaty of Baden established peace with the Empire. The reign of Louis XIV ended somewhat sadly. On May 11, 1714, the Duke of Berry died, and the son of the late Duke of Burgundy—a child of four—alone stood between the Duke of Orleans and the succession. In spite of his age and the calamities which the late war had brought upon France, Louis showed a remarkable activity in religious as well as political matters. For by the advice of his confessor, Le Tellier, he had in 1710 caused Port-Royal to be destroyed and its inmates scattered. In 1713 he supported the Bull *Unigenitus* which Clement XI had fulminated against the Jansenists, and he was busy supporting the Jacobites when he died on September 1, 1715.

*Louis XV and Failures in India and Canada,
1715-1763*

AFTER an interval of four years following the conclusion of the Peace of Utrecht the relations of France and England became friendly, and remained more or less so till the opening of the Austrian Succession War in 1740. Nevertheless, a constant source of friction existed between the two countries, owing to their rivalry on the American continent and in India.

The results of the Spanish Succession War, as far as England was concerned, were seen to be mainly colonial and commercial: for not only did England obtain Acadia (Nova Scotia)—with its 16,000 French inhabitants—and Newfoundland, but France was compelled to yield all her pretensions to the settlements held by the Hudson's Bay Company. The founders of that Company were two Frenchmen, Chouart and Radisson. Chouart, the son of a Breton pilot, emigrated to Quebec in 1641, and shortly afterwards took the name of Grosseilliers. In Canada he was joined by Radisson, a Huguenot, and after several expeditions they made, in 1661, a famous one to the North-West. They clearly perceived an opportunity of establishing a rich fur trade, but in Paris they found no support. In 1667, however, Grosseilliers and Radisson had interviews with Prince Rupert in London. In 1668 Grosseilliers returned to Canada, and in August 1669 his ship conveyed to England a cargo of furs. On May 2, 1670, Prince Rupert obtained from Charles II a charter for the Hudson's Bay Company. In 1685 the

French had dislodged the Company from all its possessions except Port Nelson, but in 1713 the Company was restored to its former position. Though France had suffered losses in the Spanish Succession War, the period from the Peace of Utrecht to the opening of the Seven Years' War was one of prosperity for the French colonies. France, during many years of that period, definitely aimed at carrying out the policy of Louis XIV in America, her constant object being to hem in the English colonists by a chain of settlements extending from the mouth of the Mississippi to Canada ; in other words, to connect Canada and Louisiana. Moreover, during the pacific ministries of Fleury and Walpole French trade flourished and the French East India Company, with Pondicherry as its chief centre, progressed. With the outbreak of war between England and France in 1743 a critical period for the French settlements in India and Canada opened, which twenty years later ended in disaster for France.

From 1713 till 1740, as has been stated, France and England were at peace, the period being an interlude in the second Hundred Years' War, which opened in 1689 and closed in 1815. For France the death of Louis XIV in 1715 marked the close of a great era in its history ; and till the outbreak of the Revolution, in spite of its apparent strength, the monarchy steadily declined. While on the surface the most striking feature of eighteenth-century Europe would seem to be the attempts made to preserve the 'balance of power', it is probably true to say that the more important side of European history during the century is the course of that movement which culminated in the French Revolution. And during the century the political opposition to the despotism of the Crown was over and over again demonstrated by the conflicts between the Court and the *Parlements*. At the same time,

it must be remembered that till the outbreak of the Seven Years' War French foreign policy had been on the whole successful, while in Canada and India the prospects seemed bright. The contrast between the unrest at home and the strong position held by France in Europe from the close of the War of the Spanish Succession to the opening of the Seven Years' War is very striking.

On the death of Louis XIV, in 1715, the Duke of Orleans became Regent, and remained so till 1723. In that year, Louis XV was proclaimed of age, and at the end of the year Orleans died. Orleans, who was a man of considerable intelligence, held liberal views, and had no sympathy with the traditions of the late régime. But he was essentially indolent, and only occasionally acted with vigour. The first years of his rule were marked by a reaction in all directions. The *Parlement* of Paris set aside Louis XIV's will, in which he had placed the government in the hands of a Council, and was reinvested with the right of remonstrance which the late King had taken from it. Orleans then formed six Councils, composed mainly of nobles, to assist in carrying on the government. In restoring the *Parlement* of Paris to its ancient privileges Orleans was unwittingly dealing the monarchy a blow from which it never recovered. The *Parlement* and the twelve provincial *Parlements* were judicial bodies, with two political rights—that of remonstrance against the royal edicts, and that of veto upon legislation. In the various courts of judicature which formed the *Parlement* of Paris some 40,000 persons were employed. At times during the century it acted as a constitutional check upon the monarchy; at other times, as in Louis XVI's reign, it opposed all attempts at reform. Nevertheless, owing to the fact that the States-General was not summoned, the *Parlement* of Paris

was regarded by the nation as the only means of ventilating grievances. Thus it acquired an influence and an importance which were in great measure undeserved. Till 1718 all seemed to go well, and all parties supported the Regent. In 1717 Dubois brought about the famous Triple Alliance between France, England, and Holland, and thus inaugurated a period of peace with England which continued till the opening of the Austrian Succession War. In 1718, however, difficulties at home arose. The grand schemes of John Law, by which the paper currency of the country was multiplied disastrously, were sanctioned by the Regent in spite of the opposition of the *Parlement* of Paris. The year 1718 marked in various ways the return of the Government to absolutism; in that year the Departmental Councils were abolished, and next year the resistance of Brittany to the demand for a subsidy ended in the suppression of the last genuine provincial liberties in France. In 1718 the Cel-lamare conspiracy had been discovered, and the Duke and Duchess of Maine imprisoned.

Thus at home the position of Orleans was secure, while the Triple Alliance had been strengthened by the adhesion of the Emperor, Charles VI, in August. It thus became the Quadruple Alliance, and proved easily able to defeat the aims of Alberoni, who had already conquered Sardinia and Sicily for the King of Spain, and, till his fall in December 1719, never relaxed his opposition to the members of the Alliance. In January of that year France declared war upon Spain, and a French army besieged Fuenterrabia. But the war closed in February 1720, and in March 1721 marriages were arranged between the two countries—Mlle de Montpensier was to marry Don Luis, the Prince of the Asturias, a marriage which took place in 1722; and Louis XV was to marry the

Infanta, who arrived in Paris in March of that year. The later years of the Regency were marked by the supremacy of Dubois (now a Cardinal), by the close of the liberal reaction of the period following the death of Louis XIV, and by the gigantic failure of Law's schemes.

Under the Regency many of the reforms which were later associated with the name of Turgot were set on foot. Road-making was carried out, interprovincial restrictions were removed, colonies were encouraged. In 1723, however, the death of Dubois in August, followed by that of Orleans in December, brought the Regency to a close. Till June 11, 1726, the Duke of Bourbon and his mistress, Madame de Prie, who supported the Jesuits, practically governed the country, their main object being apparently to overthrow the influence of Fleury, Louis XV's old tutor, and to provide Louis with a wife so that, by the birth of an heir, the chance of the young Duke of Orleans becoming King of France might be lessened. Consequently the Infanta, who was then seven years old, was sent back to Spain, and on September 4, 1725, Louis married Maria Leszczyńska. In that month France, allied with England and Prussia, was on the verge of war with Spain and Austria; the latter Powers had come together in April, and in the following November made a secret treaty aimed chiefly at England and France. Though Russia joined Austria in the following year no war took place. That peace was preserved was partly due to the efforts of Fleury, who in June 1726, on the fall of the Duke of Bourbon, had become First Minister; partly to the death of Catherine of Russia in May 1727; partly to the realization of Elizabeth Farnese that the Austrian alliance was of little value, and that Spanish finances could not bear a war. The Convention of the Pardo in March 1728 prepared the way for the Congress of Soissons,

which met on June 14 and sat for a year. Fleury, who desired above all things the continuance of peace, devoted all his energies to separating Spain and Austria from each other, and decided to maintain the alliance with England. His policy was successful, and on November 9, 1729, Spain joined England and France in the Treaty of Seville. The guarantee of the succession of Don Carlos (the son of Philip V of Spain) to the Duchy of Parma, by England and France, led to the rupture of relations between Austria and Spain. War was, however, averted by the promise of the maritime Powers to guarantee the Pragmatic Sanction, by which Charles VI bequeathed his states to his daughter, Maria Theresa, and in 1732 Don Carlos entered into quiet possession of Parma. In bringing the settlement about France had taken no share. Fleury, not intending to fight for Don Carlos, had shown such irresolution that in January 1731 a state of extreme tension existed between the two Bourbon Courts, only partly healed when the War of the Polish Succession broke out in August 1733.

The electric situation in Europe before the outbreak of that war had at any rate brought to a close Fleury's great struggle with the *Parlement* of Paris. 'For the first time for many years there was a direct, open, and serious opposition to the Crown' in the year 1730 and the two following years, on the part of the *Parlement* of Paris. In 1718 and 1720 the grounds of opposition to the Crown were financial, but from 1730 to 1771 they were religious and political. In 1730 the Archbishop of Paris endeavoured to compel his clergy to accept the Bull *Unigenitus* which had been issued in 1713, condemning 101 propositions from the work of Quesnel, a Jansenist. The *Parlement* of Paris supported the resistance of the clergy. High-handed action by the King, on Fleury's advice, only caused the *Parlement* to threaten to

suspend the whole administration of justice, and the struggle continued, many members being exiled. The imminence of war caused Fleury to recall the sentence of exile, and the opening of 1733 found the *Parlement* and Jansenism had triumphed.

The War of the Polish Succession has many important points of interest. The birth of a Dauphin in September 1729 destroyed any chance of the King of Spain ascending the throne of France; and despite the temporary coolness between the two Courts between 1730 and 1733, it was becoming obvious to many in both countries that their interests demanded an alliance. The death of Augustus II, King of Poland, in February 1733, the entry of Russian troops into Poland in August, the election of Stanislaus Leszczynski in September, followed by that of Augustus III (the Russian and Austrian candidate) in October, rendered the outbreak of a general European War inevitable. On September 26 France concluded the Treaty of Turin with Charles Emmanuel, on October 10 she declared war against Austria, and on November 7 signed the Treaty of the Escorial (the first Family Compact) with Spain. A family compact had been effected in 1721, but, like that of 1733, was an episode rather than a dominating fact in the history of the future. Fleury, in this and the War of the Austrian Succession, proved a bad War Minister, but in 1734 and 1735 Chauvelin, the Keeper of the Seals, supported by a strong war party and by public opinion generally, showed energy; and though France failed in her Polish aims, she secured by the third Treaty of Vienna, 1735, the practical possession of Lorraine and Bar, which Stanislaus, having renounced his claim to Poland, was to occupy on the death of the Grand Duke of Tuscany. The Grand Duchy was then to go as

compensation to Francis, Duke of Lorraine, who in 1736 married Maria Theresa, daughter of the Emperor Charles VI, and who himself became Emperor in 1745. It was also settled in 1735 that Don Carlos was to receive the kingdom of the Two Sicilies and the Tuscan Presidencies (Elba and some points on the coast), and to hand over Parma and Piacenza to the Emperor—an arrangement which was not approved of in France, and not in accordance with the Family Compact. Though France, following the example of England, Holland, and other Powers, consented to guarantee the Pragmatic Sanction, she only did so with secret reservations.

The close of the war found Fleury all-powerful in France; for early in 1737 Chauvelin, the head of the war party, had been disgraced, and Fleury was able to establish friendly relations with Austria. After the third Treaty of Vienna was signed he found opportunities of drawing closer the bonds between the two countries during the war of 1736-9, in which Russia and Austria were united against Turkey. In that war Austria suffered defeat, and in September 1739 the diplomacy of Villeneuve succeeded in bringing about the Treaty of Belgrade between Austria and Turkey. The close connexion between Russia and Austria was weakened, and both countries showed a readiness to secure the French alliance. France had apparently become the arbiter of Europe.

THE WARS OF THE AUSTRIAN SUCCESSION, 1740-8, AND
THE SEVEN YEARS' WAR, 1756-63

The death of the Emperor Charles VI on October 20, 1740, followed by that of Anna of Russia on October 26, overthrew all Fleury's pacific hopes. Frederick the Great, who had succeeded to the throne of Prussia in May, lost

no time in entering Silesia in December, and the Austrian Succession War broke out; and Spain had declared war upon England in August 1739. These events caused great excitement among the war party in France. For some months Fleury pursued a waiting policy, but early in 1741 the war party proved too strong for him; a French army in August crossed the Rhine, joined the Bavarians and later the Saxons, and on November 26 occupied Prague. In July 1742 Maria Theresa made the Treaty of Berlin with Frederick the Great, yielding the greater part of Silesia. The first Silesian War was thus closed, but Austria and France continued at war. In January 1743 the death of Fleury was followed by a more active policy on the part of France, which declared war on Sardinia, and after the battle of Dettingen made the second Family Compact with Spain in October. War was not actually declared upon England till March 1744, when France resumed the second Hundred Years' War, which from 1713 had been suspended. Its resumption was to have serious results for France, though their extent was not to be actually realized till 1763.

From 1740 to 1815 Europe was involved in many wars, in the majority of which France took part. From 1740 to 1763 her interests were chiefly colonial and Indian, and the struggle for predominance in America and India, between France and England, was decided by the action of sea power. The great questions to be determined during these twenty-three years were, says Admiral Mahan, 'the dominion of the sea, the control of distant countries, the possession of colonies'. France, not content with Canada and Louisiana, claimed the valleys of the Ohio and Mississippi. Had that claim been allowed, the English colonists would have been unable to expand westwards. In India she was established at Chander-

nagore, at Pondicherry, and at Mahé, and held the important islands of France and Bourbon. At this time her interests in India were watched over by Dupleix and La Bourdonnais, both men of unusual ability. The latter was convinced that the success of the French power in India depended upon securing the control of the sea. In 1744, when war with England definitely opened, La Bourdonnais had formed the Isle of France into a great naval station, while Dupleix, now Governor-General at Pondicherry, aimed at securing the supremacy of France in India by diplomacy and by alliances with the native princes. In 1745, after a drawn battle with the English fleet, La Bourdonnais besieged Madras. There he quarrelled with Dupleix (who shortly afterwards broke the agreement which had been made with the Governor of Madras) and returned to France, where after three years' imprisonment he died. Meanwhile, Dupleix seized Madras, but the war ended in 1748 and Madras was exchanged for Louisbourg. During the war the chief attention of the French Government was, however, engrossed in European affairs, to the ultimate detriment of its colonial interests.

The war which broke out in 1744 included operations in Canada, India, and on the sea, in addition to the operations in Europe. In January 1745 the Emperor Charles VII, whom France had placed on the Imperial throne, died, and in September the Grand Duke Francis, husband of Maria Theresa, became Emperor. At the end of that year the Austrian troops were able, owing to the conclusion of the Second Silesian War, to aid Charles Emmanuel of Sardinia, with the result that the French and Spanish troops were expelled from Italy, and all the interesting plans of d'Argenson for the future government of that country came to naught. Nevertheless, in 1745, 1746, and 1747 Marshal Saxe gained

a series of successes (Fontenoy, Raucoux, Lauffeldt) in the Netherlands, and in 1748 both England and France were ready for peace; as far as these two countries were concerned all conquests were restored by the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle. It would now seem that the French policy of entering into war in Europe was a serious mistake. Her true policy was to have supported Dupleix in India, and her representatives in Canada. As it was, she had seriously weakened herself for a resumption of the final struggle for supremacy in India and Canada.

Thus the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle proved to be merely a truce for eight years, during which France at home seemed to be on the brink of a revolution. The troubles which broke out in 1748 were, in the first place, due to the attempt to collect a tax. France had gained nothing by the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle, and in consequence there was great discontent in the country, which was ready to show itself. D'Argenson in his journals, speaking of the situation at that time, tells us that 'all orders are at once discontented. Everything is combustible. A revolution may be accomplished with less opposition than is supposed.' Between the years 1744 and 1754 the Court was continually quarrelling with the *Parlement*, and it was not till the latter date that Madame de Pompadour persuaded the King to make the birth of a grandson (afterwards Louis XVI) the excuse for recalling the *Parlement* of Paris, which at once took a firm line, checking the persecution of Protestants and condemning some priests to exile. Still the religious war continued, and it led to the appearance of religious scepticism in many quarters. But, in 1756, Benedict XIV wisely effected a compromise, and in consequence Jansenism was, to a certain extent, tolerated, though it was evident that ecclesiastics and monks had become increasingly unpopular. The outbreak of the Seven Years'

War, however, for a time diverted the public attention from both the *Parlement* and the Jesuits.

During the interval between the close of the Austrian Succession War and the opening of the Seven Years' War French diplomacy had been active. There was no sign of any desire on the part of the Government to form an alliance with Austria, and thus to break away from a policy which had continued since the days of Francis I. Austria, moreover, was closely united to Russia by a treaty signed in 1746, which had for its chief aim the recovery of Silesia and the break up of the Prussian kingdom. An alliance with Russia seemed impossible for France, for French policy aimed not only at maintaining close relations with Sweden and Turkey, but at strengthening Poland and saving her from absolute subjection to Russia. In Poland one party (the Saxon) desired a Russian alliance, the other (the National party) was opposed to Russian influence. Louis XV's aim was to secure the election to the Polish crown—on the death of Augustus III—for the Prince of Conti, the great-nephew of the famous Condé. The coalition of Poland, Turkey, and Sweden would then be rendered powerful, and a decided check given to Russian ambition. Des Alleurs and d'Havren-court, both partisans of Conti, were dispatched respectively to Constantinople and Sweden, while in 1752 the Comte de Broglie was sent to Poland ostensibly to oppose any alliance of Poland with Russia, but in reality to forward Conti's candidature without informing Saint-Contest, the French Foreign Minister, that he was doing so.

In 1755 success seemed to have rewarded de Broglie's efforts. Augustus III had been won over, Sweden and Turkey were ready to fall in with de Broglie's scheme, and thus in the event of a renewal of war France would be supported

by allies. But in the west of Europe a diplomatic revolution was on the point of destroying all de Broglie's work, with the result that the Partition of Poland became inevitable. The Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle was merely a truce, for the causes of antagonism between France and England were permanent. Their forces met at Fort Duquesne on the Ohio in 1754, while from 1751 onwards confused struggles took place in India, where Dupleix was endeavouring to found a French Empire. At this crisis in her history France, as in the Austrian Succession War, failed to realize that all her efforts should be devoted to the maintenance of her position in India and Canada. In 1754 Dupleix was recalled, and eight years later the French dominion in India came to an end. Both Canada and India were lost while France was employing her armies in an endeavour to restore Silesia to Maria Theresa.

In January 1756 the Second Treaty of Westminster, between Prussia and England, was the first step in the diplomatic revolution. The alliance between Austria and England had terminated the previous year, and for some time Austria had been endeavouring to come to an understanding with France. The Second Treaty of Westminster at last brought them together, and in May 1756 the Treaty of Versailles was signed. Thus the change of alliances was completed, and till the Revolution France and Austria were nominally allies. In 1757 a second Treaty of Versailles bound France more closely than ever to Austria, and French troops fought in Europe while India and Canada were being lost. Though the French took Minorca on June 28, 1756, and in September 1757 Richelieu forced from Cumberland the Convention of Klosterzeven, the French army was totally defeated at Rossbach on November 5, and in June 1758, at Crefeld, by Ferdinand of Brunswick. Choiseul, who succeeded Bernis as Minister of Foreign Affairs in 1759, could

not save France from a series of disasters. Quebec was lost, the Brest fleet was defeated at Quiberon Bay, and the Toulon fleet was destroyed. In 1760 Canada was entirely lost, and all French hopes in India were dashed to the ground.

In 1761, however, France made with Spain—now ruled by Charles III (Don Carlos)—the famous Family Compact, Charles being resolved to recover Gibraltar, and Choiseul hopeful that a league of the Bourbon Powers would be attended by beneficial results. The results, however, of this alliance were disappointing: England declared war upon Spain in January 1762, and captured Martinique, Havana, and Manila, besides several of the lesser French islands such as Grenada, St. Lucia, and St. Vincent. Elizabeth of Russia had died in January; her successor, Peter III, made an alliance in May with Frederick the Great, but on Peter's abdication in July his wife Catherine withdrew her troops from the war. Before the year closed negotiations for peace were opened, and on February 10, 1763, France and England signed the Peace of Paris. France lost Canada, retaining, however, certain fishing rights off Newfoundland and in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, as well as the islands of St. Pierre and Miquelon. She also regained Martinique, St. Lucia, Guadeloupe, Marie-Galante, La Désirade, and Goree, and restored Minorca, receiving Belle Isle in exchange. France was not to set up military establishments in India, and received back her factories.

To Spain, which could not recover Minorca, France gave New Orleans and Louisiana west of the Mississippi, while England restored to her Havana and the conquered ports of Cuba. France had now an opportunity of setting her house in order, of carrying out reforms, and of averting another revolutionary crisis. Would she avail herself of the opportunity? In 1762 Rousseau's *Contrat Social* had been published.

After the Seven Years' War

IN his early days Louis XIV seems, like Richelieu and Mazarin, to have favoured that development of transmarine conquest and commerce which seemed so likely to benefit the mother country. But he was soon absorbed by dynastic ambitions and by the vices of absolutism. In 1672 Leibnitz placed before him his *Consilium Aegyptiacum*—a memoir on Egypt which he hoped would lead Louis to carve out a great French Empire on the eastern shores of the Mediterranean: France should seize Cairo and Constantinople, and occupy North Africa; she would thus be mistress of the Mediterranean, would control the avenues of Asiatic commerce, and would be supreme on the Red Sea. Involved in costly attempts upon Germany and the Netherlands, Louis lost the best chance that France ever had of founding a great colonial empire. After the Peace of Utrecht England rapidly secured control of the ocean waterways, while France, from the outbreak of the Polish Succession War in 1733, again entangled herself in the quarrels of Central Europe. Thus, in spite of the efforts of La Bourdonnais and Dupleix in India and of Montcalm in Canada, the Seven Years' War saw the loss of French dominion in Canada and the end of French pretensions to dominion on the Coromandel coast of India.

Vauban, in his *Mémoire sur les Colonies* (1699), had shown an appreciation of the real reason of the lack of vigorous growth

in the colonies. What, in his opinion, they needed was civil and religious liberty and the abolition of commercial privileges. They were, he declared, choked by Church establishments, while the monks were 'incomparably more successful in enriching themselves than in converting the heathen'. In a striking sentence he declares that 'if the King does not take vigorous steps for strengthening his colonies, at the first war with Holland or England they will all be lost; we shall never regain our footing in America'. At the conclusion of the Seven Years' War Vauban's prediction, owing to Louis XIV's bigotry and the diversion of his attention from the colonies to ambitious schemes in Europe, was fully justified.

With the close of the Seven Years' War, then, the era of grand colonial expansion which had characterized the seventeenth century came definitely to a close. During the Seven Years' War the French Government, entangled in the quarrel between Austria and Prussia, with a weak navy and dilapidated finances (all the ocean waterways being under English control), had suffered overwhelming defeat in America, Canada, and India. Consequently it was not surprising that, having decisively failed in this unequal contest, France experienced a conflict of opinions as to the advantage of dependencies beyond the sea. Montesquieu, Voltaire, and Rousseau, all agreed for different reasons in condemning a colonial system, Rousseau on the ground that it led to the corruption or extermination of the noble savage. They all agreed, however, in reprobating that subordination of civil to ecclesiastical interests which had so often hampered the work of colonial governors, and which was one of the chief causes of the loss of Canada. Even in India it was said that the intrigues of the Jesuit Laval had accelerated the fall of Lally.

No sooner was the Seven Years' War brought to a close than the conflict between the Crown and the *Parlement* of Paris was renewed—in fact, till 1770 the *Parlement* continued to resist the financial demands of the Crown, and was encouraged to do so by popular feeling. In other directions the *Parlement* was active. In 1764, owing to its opposition to the Jesuits, in which it was powerfully supported by the philosophers and public opinion, Louis XV, acting in agreement with Choiseul, issued an edict abolishing the Order in France. During his period of office Choiseul refused to entertain any idea of crushing the *Parlements*. He was, indeed, chiefly interested in questions of foreign policy; his chief aims were to defeat England, to destroy the effects of the Treaty of Paris, and, by intervening in the east and north of Europe, to strengthen Poland, Turkey, and Sweden.

This ambitious foreign policy necessitated careful preparation, and from 1761 to 1766 he busied himself with the reform of the army and navy. In 1766 he resumed the control of foreign affairs, and remained the dominating influence in the ministry till his fall. Affairs in the East first demanded his attention; for in 1764 Russia and Prussia, anticipating as it were events in 1863, drew together over the question of Poland. Till 1768 Catherine seemed to have carried out her wishes with regard to that country, though her plans were somewhat interfered with by the outbreak of war with Turkey and by the threatening attitude of France. But, as in 1863-4, France was unable to render any efficient aid to the Poles, and Louis XV, like Napoleon III, was forced to look on while Russia and Prussia worked their will upon Poland. Choiseul's policy with regard to Sweden, however, succeeded, and after his fall his aims were carried out by his successor d'Aiguillon. Gustavus III, who visited Paris at the close of

1770, received on his return to Sweden a large French subsidy, and owing to the preoccupation of Catherine II with Poland and Turkey, was able to carry out a revolution and thus to save his country from the fate of the two eastern countries.

Choiseul fell from power in December 1770, his fall being due partly to the influence of Madame du Barry, partly to Louis XV's well-grounded apprehension that the minister's Eastern policy would involve him in war with Russia, and that he contemplated an early renewal of war with England. Spain had in January attacked the English settlement in the Falkland Islands, and d'Aranda, relying on the Family Compact, was confident of French assistance in a war which he regarded as imminent. But Louis XV had no sympathy with 'a plan of campaign against England', and none with Choiseul's toleration of, and concessions to, the *Parlements*. The royal quarrel with the latter reached a head in the autumn of 1770, and on December 24 Choiseul was dismissed. Varied are the estimates which historians have held of Choiseul's claim to statesmanship. The acquisition of Corsica in 1769 was due to him; and he advocated in the same year a French advance into Egypt—for he fully recognized the importance of safeguarding the extensive French interests in the Mediterranean. In this he anticipated the Egyptian projects of Napoleon, and those of Louis Philippe's advisers in 1839. Like Napoleon, too, he seems to have realized the importance of Egypt to France in view of the French interests in India. On the Family Compact of 1761 with Spain he based great hopes. 'All other alliances', he hoped, 'should be subordinated to this union.' France still possessed St. Dominique, Martinique, and Guiana, and he formed plans, which were never realized, for close co-operation

with Spain in the Pacific. Like Napoleon I and Napoleon III, he hoped for the establishment of a French Empire in some part of the American continent. Was Choiseul, as Talleyrand declared him to be, 'one of the most prophetically-minded men of our generation', or was he 'only a fanatic and a blunderer'? At any rate, some of his adventurous schemes showed foresight, but his domestic policy as regards the *Parlements* was unwise, and his attitude towards financial questions was open to grave criticism. His domestic policy certainly contributed to the weakening of the French monarchy, which, after his fall, steadily declined, in spite of the efforts of Turgot and his successors.

The fall of Choiseul had a serious effect upon the state of parties in France—it was the signal for the *Parlement* of Paris to become more violent than ever. His fall was regarded by the Jesuit party in France as an opportunity to avenge itself upon the *Parlement*. The great quarrel of 1756 had never in reality been closed, and since the disastrous Peace of Paris the *Parlement* had increased its pretensions. It was aided by the blow which the Seven Years' War had inflicted upon the royal power, by the expulsion of the Jesuits in 1764—a great triumph for the *Parlement*—by the loss of influence by the Papacy, and by the opinion of Voltaire and of other sceptical writers. Not that Voltaire supported the *Parlement*; on the contrary, he hated that body as being opposed to toleration and reform. It burnt the books of free-thinkers, it had an annual procession in honour of the Massacre of St. Bartholomew, it fought against the issue of loans upon interest, it resisted the practice of inoculation. Its judicial posts could be purchased. But as being the outspoken opponent of despotism and of the Jesuits, it acquired a popularity which continued till the outbreak of the Revolution. Moreover,

it questioned the King's right to impose taxes without its consent, or to hold a *Lit de Justice*, or to exile or arrest its members. It was naturally supported by the provincial *Parlements*. In April 1770 the Duc d'Aiguillon, who was accused by the *Parlement* of Rennes of abuses in his government of Brittany, was by the King's orders tried before the *Parlement* of Paris, and after two months Louis declared the Duke to be exonerated from every charge. In reply the *Parlement* declared that the Duke was not to exercise any of the functions of the peerage till he was formally acquitted. The King carried away the register, and on December 7 appointed Maupeou Chancellor, at the same time declaring that the conduct of the *Parlement* was seditious. On December 24 Choiseul was dismissed ; and on January 20, 1771, by a *coup d'état*, the *Parlement* and the provincial *Parlements* were suppressed.

Success attended this drastic action by the Crown, till talk of revolution ceased. The purchase of judicial posts came to an end, and the courtiers, the priests, and Voltaire were delighted. But ultimately the Crown suffered, for the opposition to the royal power now fell into the hands of the men of letters, and political writings and political speculation increased. Moreover, the Government, instead of pursuing a consistent line of policy, adopted a policy of alternate resistance and concession, the only effect of which was to uproot all feeling of reverence for the royal power.

From 1770 to 1774 France had for its Ministry a Triumvirate consisting of d'Aiguillon, Minister of Foreign Affairs, Maupeou, Minister of Justice, and Terray, Minister of Finance. Though the Ministry was unable to take any steps to prevent the First Partition of Poland in 1772, it gave prompt assistance and countenance to Gustavus III,

who established absolutism in Sweden in 1772 and renewed his alliance with France the following year.

Thus, while Turkey, shortly after Louis XV's death, had to accept the Treaty of Kutchuk-Kainardji in 1774, and Poland in 1772 a partial partition, Sweden in alliance with France preserved and strengthened its monarchical constitution, and was safe from Russian intervention. Meanwhile Maupeou, in place of the *Parlement* of Paris and the provincial *Parlements*, had established the *Parlement Maupeou*, as it was called, and new Courts of Justice. Terray, being now independent of the opposition of the *Parlement* of Paris, made a declaration of national bankruptcy in order to pay the royal debts. In May 1774 Louis died, leaving the authority of the Crown seriously discredited in Paris and the great towns, and the *ancien régime* in a state of dislocation.

■

II

The Critical Years, 1774-1788

THE history of France from the death of Louis XIV to 1788 is the history of the approach of the Revolution. That Revolution was not the first serious internal disorder which France had experienced. From the days of Philip Augustus, when the French kingdom was firmly established, crises of a revolutionary character had occasionally taken place. The movements connected with Étienne Marcel in the fourteenth century, with the League in the sixteenth century, and with the *Fronde* in the seventeenth, were all more or less revolutionary—‘*éruptions périodiques qui, couvrant le sol de débris, y sèment des germes de renaissance.*’¹ The Revolution of 1789 marked, it has been said, the culminating point of this series of revolutionary attempts. In truth, during the reign of Louis XV, notably in the years between the close of the Austrian Succession War and the opening of the Seven Years’ War, the outbreak of a widespread revolution seemed a likely event.

In 1789, however, the Crown was not only discredited, but through a variety of causes it had been thoroughly undermined. Fénelon, Lord Acton tells us, ‘knew that France was on the road to ruin’, and he lived when the power of the Crown under Louis XIV was at its zenith. From his time unbelief steadily grew, and Christianity found no support from Voltaire or Montesquieu, or even from Turgot. D’Argenson, the Minister of Foreign Affairs in 1745, clearly realized that

¹ Aubertin, *L’Esprit public au xviii^{me} siècle* p. 493.

the State was rapidly going to pieces, and before many years had passed Rousseau had declared that the people were infallible. At the time of Louis XV's death despotic government had become intolerable, with the result that the cry for reform was universal, and the middle classes, not less than the peasants, were insistent in their demand for a radical change in the system of government. The ideas of the philosophers and economists were rapidly spreading, and there was a general and widespread discontent at the continued existence of the privileges of the nobles and the inability of the middle classes to take a share in political life.

Of the men who influenced human thought in France Montesquieu, Voltaire, the contributors to the *Encyclopaedia*, and Rousseau were most prominent. Montesquieu, who was born in 1689, was by inheritance one of the Presidents of the *Parlement* of Bordeaux. In his *Persian Letters*, which were anonymous, he satirized the arbitrary government of Louis XV. In 1729 he had visited England, and was much impressed by the 'liberty and equality' which he found existing in London. In 1748 appeared the famous *Spirit of the Laws*, which illustrated Montesquieu's admiration of the English form of government. The whole work was characterized by a spirit of moderation which made it exceedingly distasteful to the more ardent philosophers, such as Condorcet, who violently denounced Montesquieu's view that political good is always found between extremes. Unlike the work of Montesquieu, that of Voltaire and his followers was negative, and favoured demolition. Voltaire, who was born in 1694, was a poet, a writer on history and on many other subjects; but he is chiefly known to fame as a prominent enemy of the Church of France. For many years he was recognized as the most conspicuous of literary Frenchmen, and the head of the

party of the Philosophers. In 1723 his poem *La Henriade* was published and aroused much attention; but in 1726, owing to a quarrel with a French officer who procured his incarceration in the Bastille for a fortnight, he quitted France and lived in England for three years. While there, among other works he wrote his *Lettres Philosophiques*, which in 1734 were promptly condemned by the Church and the *Parlement* of Paris. Henceforward he continued to issue polemical works, and his literary activity only ceased with his death in 1778. The Church in France, in the eighteenth century, had no champion such as Bossuet or Fénelon. Its internal condition was far from satisfactory, and among the laity an atheistic attitude was not uncommon. Though the Church found many defenders, the persecution of the Jansenists weakened its position, and Louis XV's bishops were not remarkable for special ability.

Though the *Contrat Social* was published in 1762, its extraordinary influence dates from about the time of Louis XV's abolition of the *Parlements*. From that time the enthusiasm for Rousseau steadily increased, till it culminated in the erection of his statue in the National Assembly and in the adoption of his teaching by St. Just and Robespierre. While Montesquieu, Voltaire, and Rousseau were busy formulating proposals for carrying out changes in the existing government of France, the School of the Economists, which was represented by such men as Quesnay, Mercier de la Rivière, and Le Trosni, was busy suggesting 'complete liberty of industry and commerce' and 'a total transformation of the internal administration'. The economists were mostly monarchical, for in their opinion a 'legal despotism' could best carry out the necessary administrative reforms. They advocated a general income-tax, to take the place of the exist-

ing methods of taxation, and the abolition of monopolies, forced labour, feudal burdens, and commercial restraints. Under the influence of this school the interest in politics grew so rapidly that, on the accession of Louis XVI, there was scarcely a young man, we are told, 'who on leaving college does not form a project of establishing a new system of philosophy and of government, and scarcely a writer who does not think himself obliged to . . . teach the Powers of the earth the best method of governing their States'.

Like many of his contemporaries, such as Joseph II, Catherine II, and Charles III of Spain, Louis XVI—who ascended the throne in 1774—was a reforming monarch, and the appointment to office of such men as Malesherbes, Turgot, and later of Necker renders this fact undeniable. But he lacked resolution, and the 'impulse in the direction of liberal improvement was intermittent'. The first fifteen years of his reign were, therefore, a period of bitter disappointment to those who realized that only by drastic reforms could revolution be averted. At the same time the foreign policy of France, under the guidance of Vergennes, seemed to have achieved highly satisfactory results. France during the War of American Independence avenged herself upon Great Britain for her losses in the Seven Years' War; and till the death of Vergennes at the beginning of 1787 she held apparently the position of the leading European Power, though from 1783 to 1787 Calonne's extravagance, for which the nation by its insistence in aiding the Americans was responsible, had rendered the outbreak of the Revolution inevitable.

At this critical period France was unfortunate in her sovereign and his queen. Both were absolutely incapable of appreciating the real situation. Louis' favourable attitude

towards reform at any rate was manifested in his appointment of Turgot and Necker, but after the latter's dismissal in 1781 the influence of the Queen became omnipotent. Marie Antoinette had no conception of the responsibilities of a queen, and her reckless extravagance knew no bounds. She always stood between the King and his tendencies towards reform. In the early years of the reign all seemed to go well, though even then keen observers noted that the Queen's influence over Louis was very marked. As early as 1777 Joseph II, when visiting Paris, told his sister that her frivolity rendered her unfit to wear a crown. Her very light-heartedness and natural love of pleasure in her early married days were used as a handle by her enemies, and charges were made against her which, though they could not be substantiated and were often utterly groundless, damaged her in public opinion. Both she and Louis XVI were unfitted in every respect for the times in which they lived and for the situation in which they were placed—a situation which would have perplexed even a man of the astuteness of Charles II of England.

Ever since the death of Louis XIV the tendency towards revolutionary changes was steadily becoming more and more apparent. There was no general hostility to the monarchy; from May 1784 to August 1792 the deposition of Louis was not seriously considered or generally desired. But there was a widespread and fixed determination to get rid of the whole system and apparatus of the *ancien régime*. On every ground therefore it behoved Louis XVI to walk warily, and to select as ministers those who were anxious to carry out the reforms which alone could avert the advancing storm.

On the accession of Louis XVI in 1774 Maurepas, 'a useless old man', became First Minister, Vergennes Minister of

Foreign Affairs, and, in August of that year, Turgot (a member of an old noble family of Normandy) *Contrôleur Général des Finances*. The task of averting the *déluge* did not seem to be impossible, provided that such men as Turgot were loyally supported. Turgot was apparently given an opportunity of conferring on the country the benefit of the experience which he had gained, since 1761, while acting as *Intendant* of the Limoges district for thirteen years. But no sooner had Turgot been appointed Controller-General than Louis recalled, in November, the *Parlement*—‘the strongest opponents to real reform’. The results of this act were overwhelmingly disastrous, and a revolution became a certainty. For Louis, instead of supporting Turgot in his admirable reforms, allowed himself to be influenced by the *Parlement* of Paris, the nobles, and the financiers, who refused to sacrifice their privileges or to abandon their gains, and who found a strong supporter in Marie Antoinette. His enemies at once took action. In September 1774 the internal restrictions on the price of corn had been, by order of the Council, removed. In April and May 1775 the grain-ring, or group of monopolists acting with Turgot’s enemies, of whom the Prince of Conti was the chief, organized riots which spread to Versailles and Paris. This Corn War alarmed Louis, who, instead of acting vigorously against the monopolists, continued to listen to the ever-increasing number of Turgot’s enemies. Before his fall Turgot had proposed the abolition of a number of hindrances to the freedom of commerce and industry. He had abolished the *Jurandes* or corporation of crafts. He had substituted for the *corvée* a tax to which the privileged classes had to contribute. In March 1776 Turgot’s edicts were registered in a *Lit de Justice*, in spite of the hostility of the *Parlement* of Paris;

but shortly afterwards, on May 12, Louis allowed himself to be persuaded by the opponents of all reform, among whom was the Queen, to dismiss the minister, who had lost the support of Maurepas. Without a rational financial system, and without a constitution, the French system of government was doomed. It was not till the Revolution that Turgot's measures were re-enacted.

Before his fall Turgot had procured the abolition of chartered companies with commercial monopolies, thus freeing the trade between France and her remaining colonies. Turgot, indeed, had made no effort to conciliate opposition. Moreover, like Joseph II a few years later, he attempted too much. Still, he had abolished thousands of useless offices and many monopolies; he had improved the mode of collecting the *taille*; he had done away with the *corvée* (forced and unpaid labour) for making roads; he had restored free trade in corn and in wine; he had suppressed the guilds which interfered with a man's freedom in selecting his career. Shortly before his fall he founded the *Caisse d'Escompte*, a joint-stock association for benefiting French commerce, and he proposed to make uniform and to reduce indirect taxes.

His colleague, Malesherbes, Minister of the Royal Household, who resigned his office shortly before the dismissal of Turgot, also carried out many beneficial measures, among which were the check which he placed on the issue of *lettres de cachet*, and the release from the State prisons of many innocent persons. He also urged the convocation of the States-General as a means of reducing the *Parlements* to insignificance. With these two reforming ministers was connected the Comte de St.-Germain, whose army reforms—such as the abolition of sinecures—owing to a too close imitation of the Prussian methods, led to the serious disaffec-

tion which showed itself among the troops in 1789. Before the storm caused by his reforming measures St.-Germain fell in September 1777, as did his successor, Montbarrey, in 1780, from the same cause. The Comte de Ségur, a veteran who had fought in Flanders, was then appointed, and for a time all went well.

Turgot was succeeded as Controller-General by Clugny de Nuis, who distinguished himself by reversing most of his predecessor's reforms and by setting on foot a lottery loan. He died in October 1776 at a critical moment; for war with Great Britain was impending, the French nation welcoming the opportunity to avenge the loss of Canada. Though Louis and Maurepas by no means favoured war, the pressure of public opinion rendered preparations for its possible outbreak necessary. In so far as the coming Revolution was due to the financial straits in which France found herself, the blame must be shared by the French nation with the King. Turgot had opposed all idea of war, and Louis himself only proposed to help the colonists in secret. But public opinion in 1776 became increasingly warlike, and Necker, who shared the functions of the Controller-General (and the title of Director-General of the Finances) with Taboureaux, was soon called upon to provide funds to meet the cost of the war.

Necker, who hailed from Switzerland, was a wealthy banker and a Protestant. He was in no sense a statesman: he was immeasurably inferior to Turgot, and he never seems to have realized the approach of the Revolution. A vain man, over-anxious about his own reputation, Necker was, however, convinced of the necessity for reforms, administrative as well as financial. The situation in October 1776 was indeed serious. The Declaration of American Independence

had aroused much enthusiasm in France, and Burgoyne's surrender at Saratoga in October 1777 was followed in 1778 by a treaty between France and the American colonies, and war with Great Britain. Thus the French seized the opportunity of reprisal against England, but at a heavy cost to themselves. Meanwhile Necker, on taking office, found himself faced by an enormous deficit, and by the necessity of meeting the demands for warlike preparations.

Before the actual outbreak of war with England Necker embarked on the path of reform, in spite of the opposition of the Queen. He followed the example of Turgot in abolishing useless offices, he stopped the grants of pensions as far as he was able, and reduced the number of the Farmers-General of the taxes. Further, he endeavoured to give self-government to the provinces, and freed the remaining serfs on the royal domain. He, however, never realized the necessity for immediate and drastic reforms; and while Turgot attempted to do too much good at once, Necker tried to do good piecemeal.¹

When war broke out with Great Britain in 1778, Necker found himself called upon to provide vast sums. French forces were attacking the English in America, on the Atlantic, on the Indian Ocean. Ireland was threatened with a French invasion. French and Spanish ships swept the Channel. In this war France gave invaluable aid to the Americans, enabling them to secure independence. Though England preserved her hold on India and Canada, and held Gibraltar, she lost the American colonies and Minorca. Her weakness, moreover, forced her to give Ireland Home Rule.

During the war and until his resignation on May 19, 1781, Necker defrayed the enormous expenses which he was

¹ *Cambridge Modern History*, vol. viii, p. 91.

called upon to meet by loans—amounting, it is asserted, to 530,000,000 livres. He imposed no new taxes, and consequently could not properly provide either for interest or for a sinking fund. And as the public was not likely to endure in peace heavier taxation than it had borne in war, we must allow that Necker prepared a grievous embarrassment for his successors, and hastened the overthrow of the French monarchy.¹ The immediate cause of his fall was the publication of his celebrated *Compte rendu au Roi*, in which he drew a pleasing picture of the revenue and resources of France in time of peace. The popularity which Necker gained by this publication roused the jealousy of Maurepas. A series of intrigues followed, the *Parlement* of Paris entering upon a contest with Necker which ended in the latter's victory. But this victory proved the minister's undoing; for, feeling secure from all attacks, he demanded a seat in the Council, as Minister of State, not realizing how strong would be the opposition to such a demand, coming from a Protestant. So great, indeed, was the outcry of the other ministers that, in spite of Marie Antoinette's support of Necker, Louis acted as in the case of Turgot—ignored public opinion, and dealt a severe blow to the cause of monarchy in France. By acts of such egregious folly the Crown was bound to lose the confidence of the nation.

Louis' unfortunate choice, on his accession, of Maurepas as Chief Minister must be placed among the causes of the fall of the monarchy. A reaction against the policy of Turgot and Necker at once set in. Maurepas was again supreme, and appointed as Controller-General a certain Joly de Fleury, a man of very ordinary abilities and one in whom the financiers had no confidence. Consequently great difficulty

¹ *Cambridge Modern History*, vol. viii, p. 93.

was experienced in obtaining funds for the war, which still continued, and Fleury's sale of offices only relieved the situation to a very small extent. Maurepas' triumph was, however, short-lived, for he died in November 1781, six months after the dismissal of Necker.

From 1781 to his death in 1787 Vergennes became the most prominent of the King's ministers. His knowledge of foreign politics was profound, and throughout his career he invariably showed considerable ability. Having held the French Embassy at Constantinople, he had been appointed Minister for Foreign Affairs on Louis XVI's accession. At Constantinople Vergennes had realized the evil effect upon French interests of the Peace of Paris. In 1778 Joseph II and his minister, Kaunitz, brought forward claims upon Bavaria. Relying upon the Franco-Austrian Alliance, Joseph hoped to be able to overcome the opposition of Frederick the Great to his project. Louis XVI, however, supported Vergennes in his refusal to countenance the Bavarian claims of his brother-in-law Joseph, and joined with Catherine of Russia in the spring of 1779 in guaranteeing the Treaty of Teschen between Prussia and Austria. Involved as France was in a war with England, the European policy pursued by Vergennes did him great credit. He showed, moreover, no little astuteness in supporting the republican party in Holland, with the result that the Dutch declared war upon Great Britain in 1779.

On January 20, 1783, preliminaries of peace were signed on behalf of France and Spain with England; and in September they were included in the Treaty of Versailles. France regained St. Lucia, with the restoration of her establishments in Bengal, Orissa, Pondicherry, and Surat, and also Calicut and the fort of Mahé. She also received Tobago,

St. Vincent, Dominica, Grenada, St. Christopher, Nevis, and Montserrat, together with Senegal and Goree in Africa.

The close of the American War of Independence found France the most prominent of the Great Powers. Owing to the brilliant part played in that war by the French contingent, and to the victories of Bouillé, d'Estaing, La Pérouse, and Crillon, France seemed to be the arbiter of Europe. During the previous fifteen years she had saved Gustavus III, and by the Peace of Teschen she, with Russia, had pacified Germany; she had stirred up the Armed Neutrality of 1780 against Great Britain, she had avenged her defeat and losses in the Seven Years' War by aiding the Americans to secure their independence. Great Britain was isolated in Europe, for not only Sweden, but Spain, Holland, Prussia, and Turkey all looked upon France as their friend, and Russia and Austria recognized her power. All these triumphs France owed to Vergennes. An indefatigable worker, Vergennes was, till his death, in a position which no underhand intrigues could shake. He was indispensable, and the foreign policy of France under his guidance will always stand in striking contrast to the failure of successive ministers to carry out the necessary financial reforms.

The Treaty of Versailles, which ushered in a period of delusive calm for France, was a distinct triumph for Vergennes' foreign policy, and in the war with Great Britain he had had the full support of the French nation. The minister had early in 1777 declared against a policy of aggression in Europe, and had anticipated the views of the Constituent Assembly—views that held good up to the dissolution of that Assembly in the autumn of 1791. Till his death in February 1787 the foreign policy of France was eminently successful. Before the close of 1783 Joseph II astonished Europe by demanding

the opening of the Scheldt, the demolition of the Dutch fortresses on that river, the surrender of Maestricht, and certain changes of the frontier between Belgium and Holland. In making these demands he seems to have expected French support, instead of which he only received the offer of French mediation. He therefore showed no hesitation, but collected an army in Belgium, while the Dutch, as a preparatory measure of defence, repeated the action which they took in 1672, at the time of the French invasion, and opened the sluices. As Frederick the Great was prepared to help them, Europe was threatened with war. However, that danger was averted on November 8, 1785, by the Treaty of Fontainebleau, under which Joseph obtained ten million francs and gave up his claims on Maestricht, while the Scheldt remained closed. In the same year Joseph's scheme for uniting Bavaria with Austria, and placing the Elector in possession of Belgium, was defeated owing to the opposition of Frederick the Great, the formation of the *Fürstenbund* (League of Princes), and the refusal of any assistance from Vergennes.

During this European crisis Vergennes had informed Joseph that the policy of France was, as ever, to protect small States, and had definitely refused his proposal that France should take a portion of Belgium. France, he said, lay in the centre of Europe, and her King considered his throne in the light of a tribunal whose duty was to see that the rights and dominions of all sovereign Powers were respected.¹

Throughout this exciting year Vergennes had shown great ability. He had saved Belgium, and on November 8 he made an alliance, followed by a commercial treaty, with the States-General of the United Provinces.

In the following year, 1786, the Commercial Treaty with

¹ Sorel, *L'Europe et la Révolution Française*, vol. i, p. 313 et seq.

England, as stipulated in the 18th Article of the Treaty of Versailles, was concluded. It was hoped by Pitt, and by leading Frenchmen, that the treaty would diminish 'the national hatred which has hitherto separated France from England'. The danger of any fresh outbreak of war between the two countries was, however, not entirely removed, owing to the increased influence of France in the United Provinces, and to the division of the latter country between the oligarchy of provincial estates and the government of the Stadtholder, William V. While France supported the former party, the sympathies of the British Government were with the latter, though Pitt was resolved to take no action which would lead to a rupture with France and Frederick the Great, who feared the possibility of a return to the alliance between France and Austria. Frederick, however, died on August 17, 1786, and was succeeded by his nephew Frederick William II, who was the brother of Wilhelmina, the Stadtholder's wife.

The death of Frederick the Great was followed by that of Vergennes on February 13, 1787, and it only required the arrest of Wilhelmina in June by a body of republican troops to bring matters to a crisis. A Prussian army, in September, crossed the Dutch frontier, and Pitt decided to support the King of Prussia. If France had taken action at this crisis the French Revolution might have been postponed. But the seriousness of the financial situation was now realized in France. Matters had reached such a crisis that it was no wonder that Montmorin declared at the end of October that France had no intention of interfering in the affairs of Holland. It was apparent to him that, in order to reorganize the finances of France and to carry out reforms which were absolutely necessary, a period of peace must be secured. 'Sa neutralité, par la force des choses,' wrote

Albert Sorel, 'devenait de l'effacement.' The policy of supporting Turkey, Poland, and Sweden could no longer be upheld; and Russia and Austria were able to carry out their eastern designs with no fear of interference on the part of France. The death of Vergennes thus brought about crises in the east as well as the west of Europe. Under these circumstances it is not surprising that the Stadtholder was restored, and that Great Britain, Prussia, and Holland formed the famous Triple Alliance of 1788, which contributed so successfully to the maintenance of peace in Western Europe during the succeeding three years. For a time France had retired from any active participation in foreign politics. The reckless financial policy of Calonne left her no alternative.

Joly de Fleury, the successor of Necker, held office from January 1781 to March 1783. His attempt to set up a Council of Finance was unpopular with his colleagues. When he resigned he was succeeded by Lefèvre d'Ormesson, an honest man who was quite incapable of dealing with the financial situation. Ormesson retired in November 1783, and a man of very different calibre then became Controller-General. Charles Alexandre de Calonne has been described as 'a courtly, engaging personage, eloquent, sanguine, open to large ideas, fertile in bold experiments, but incurably frivolous and unscrupulous. In private life a spendthrift and votary of pleasure, in public life anxious to conciliate and astonish, he undertook—perhaps hoped—to set everything right without offending anybody.'¹

Considering the inexhaustible resources of France, can it be said that there was no *prima facie* justification for his confidence? Provided that he could gain the public con-

¹ *Cambridge Modern History*, vol. viii, p. 97.

fidence, had he not good reason to hope that peace would be followed by the revival of business with a consequent growth of prosperity? Though he introduced some judicious measures he, however, persisted in a system of reckless borrowing. The first serious blow to the confidence which to some extent had been reposed in him by the French nation was the appearance of a work by Necker, *The Administration of the Finances of France*, which had an amazing circulation. In the late autumn of 1786, in spite of the prosperity of France, Calonne found the issue of new loans was impossible. He therefore proposed to carry out the reforms proposed by Turgot, and urged that a Council of Notables should be summoned to discuss the situation.

A most dramatic if painful situation was created in February 1787. That month will always remain famous in the history of France. On the 22nd, not many days after the death of Vergennes, the meeting of the Notables took place to consider Calonne's propositions of reform. 'At the beginning of the year 1787,' says Gentz, an able German statesman, 'no one in France had the faintest presentiment of the catastrophe that was preparing.' From 1783 to 1787 the French monarchy enjoyed a high degree of consideration in Europe, and Sir James Harris, our Ambassador at The Hague, spoke of the grandeur of the French monarchy, which 'is settled on a foundation beyond the reach of the follies of the Court to shake'. A close alliance between France and Holland existed, a treaty of commerce with England had been made, the influence of France abroad never seemed higher. Moreover, in the late war with Great Britain France had shown that she possessed a navy which as regarded seamanship and the valour of its crews was in no wise inferior to that of Great Britain. 'In 1782', writes Mr. Theodore Roosevelt, 'the

French marine was at its highest point ; it was commanded by officers of ability and experience, promoted largely for merit, and with crews thoroughly trained, especially in gunnery, by a long course of service on the sea.' ¹

Nevertheless, to a close observer there must have been good reason for anxiety. The affair of the Diamond Necklace in 1785 brought down upon the Queen suspicion and obloquy, for which there was not the slightest ground. In 1809 the Marquess of Buckingham, in a letter to Lord Grenville, in which he draws a gloomy picture of 'all that is going on in the House of Commons', says that 'the whole procedure, in all its course, objects, and its bearings, is entirely like that of the Queen of France's necklace (which every Frenchman will tell you was the first scene of the Revolution tragedy) '.

While on the surface there seemed to be no danger of a political crisis, suddenly in February 1787 a complete change took place in the position of France on the Continent, and in the situation at home. The Revolution became inevitable, and Turgot's prediction that the American War would prove a fatal turning-point in French finance proved absolutely correct. The immediate cause of the crisis in February 1787 was the confession of Calonne that there were no means for meeting the enormous deficit of about 115 million livres. In the autumn of the same year Montmorin, the successor of Vergennes, found himself obliged to declare that France would not interfere in the affairs of Holland. In other words, the financial crisis had brought France to the verge of ruin, and all considerations of foreign policy had to yield before the pressing domestic questions which now demanded immediate solution. The saying that 'the penny makes the revolution' was never so aptly illustrated.

¹ Th. Roosevelt, *Naval War of 1812*, p. 505.

Though the financial crisis came as a surprise to the nation, which owing to its eagerness to enter into the War of American Independence was, to no small extent, responsible for that crisis, it had long been apparent that political and social changes were demanded by the French people. The public production of Beaumarchais' *Mariage de Figaro* in April 1784, amid a scene of extraordinary excitement, marked the destruction of respect for the things that were. 'Avec la représentation du *Mariage de Figaro*,' writes M. de Vitu, 'disparaissent de la scène française non seulement le respect pour l'ordre social de ce temps-là, le rang, la naissance, les privilèges, la noblesse, la magistrature, et pour l'ordre social de tous les temps.' Beaumarchais aided in precipitating the *culbute générale* of the social order.

The meeting of the Notables, who had been called in February 1787 to discuss Calonne's reform proposals, was dissolved in May by Loménie de Brienne, the Archbishop of Toulouse, who had succeeded Calonne in April. But Brienne's difficulties were by no means diminished. The *Parlement* of Paris opposed his financial proposals, and demanded the meeting of the States-General. Though Louis insisted on the registration of the financial edicts, the *Parlement* in August protested, and demanded the prosecution of Calonne, who fled to England. It was then exiled, and riots broke out in Paris. On September 24 the *Parlement*, which agreed to a compromise with the Crown, was recalled amid scenes of rejoicing in Paris.

All attempts, however, made during 1787 and 1788 to raise money even from the clergy failed, and the creation of Provincial Assemblies did not in any way alleviate the situation. Quarrels continued to take place between the *Parlement* of Paris in 1788 and the Government, in which the *Parlement*

defied the Crown. Matters came to a head with a meeting of the three Estates of Dauphiné at Vizille. That Assembly demanded the convocation of the States-General. The situation was one which Brienne was incapable of dealing with, especially as the treasury was practically empty. It was therefore decided to summon the States-General for May 1, 1789: Brienne was dismissed on August 25, and Necker became Minister of Finance and a member of the Council.

On May 5, 1789, the States-General met at Versailles. The interval of delusive calm that followed the Peace of 1783 was now to be succeeded by a storm which plunged France for over twenty years into continental wars, which drove her commerce off the seas, destroyed her navy, and rendered her for many years incapable of resuming distant enterprises.

The Revolutionary Period, 1789-1799

FRANCE had several times in her history experienced revolutionary movements. The rising headed by Étienne Marcel; the attempts of the League in the sixteenth century; the *Fronde* movement in the seventeenth century; and what nearly amounted to the outbreak of a revolution in the years immediately preceding the Seven Years' War—all testified to the existence of elements which at any critical time might throw the governmental machine into disorder. Moreover, the eighteenth century as it proceeded had given many indications of the absence of political morality on the part of the Powers. The seizure of Silesia by Frederick the Great, the partition of Poland by Russia, Prussia, and Austria, the attempt made upon Belgium by Joseph II, the avowed designs of Catherine II upon Turkey—all these were evidences of the break up of Old Europe. The meeting of the States-General in 1789 was not regarded by statesmen such as Pitt as a very extraordinary occurrence, but as an event which would not necessarily involve Europe in any crisis; while Austria, Russia, and Prussia welcomed it as affording them an opportunity of strengthening their positions and possibly of enlarging their frontiers.

The ministry of Calonne and the financial break-down of the Government coincided in point of time with the growing influence—political and sentimental—of the successful American Revolution. 'Nothing is more certain', wrote the late Lord Acton, 'than that American principle pro-

foundly influenced France and determined the course of the Revolution.' The ideas that the end of government is liberty, and that a single Chamber is adequate for a country, were also derived from the American Republic. With the fall of Calonne, followed by the fall of Brienne and the calling of the States-General, the weakness of the French political system was revealed. The policy of centralization followed from the days of Richelieu had been carried too far, and during Louis XIV's reign the influence of Paris had steadily increased; all intellectual independence had been systematically put down, and the *Parlement* of Paris was silenced. Under Richelieu the nobles as a political power were suppressed; and after their attempts to assert themselves during the *Fronde* they were forced to accept, under Louis XIV, a position of dependence on the Crown. Unfortunately they were allowed to retain their social privileges, of which the chief were immunity from taxation, and many rights (such as the *corvée* and the *gabelle*). Similarly the Church was a feudal and privileged institution, and continued its hostility to independent thought to within a few years of the Revolution, in spite of the intellectual revolt associated with Montesquieu, Diderot, the Encyclopaedists, Voltaire, and Rousseau.

Many were the causes which were hastening revolution in France. The hardships suffered by the small proprietors all over the country, the separation of classes into privileged and non-privileged, and the rigid barriers between classes were a constant source of difficulty. Thus there was no unity in the French nation, which was ruled by the most highly centralized Government in Europe.

During 1789 the Revolution proceeded rapidly. After a deadlock of six weeks, the Third Estate, joined by some of the clergy, declared itself the National Assembly. The

Séance royale, which followed the Oath of the Tennis Court on June 20, proved an unfortunate event. The King did indeed promise reforms, but he ordered the three Estates to separate. Led by Mirabeau and strengthened by the adhesion of about 150 more of the clergy, the Assembly refused obedience to the royal order. The King yielded, and commanded the nobles on June 27 to join the National Assembly, which was now faced by the danger of armed opposition on the part of the Court. Troops under the Comte d'Artois were moved towards Paris, and Necker was dismissed on July 12. A crisis had now to be faced by the Assembly, and on July 14 it was solved by the Paris mob, which captured the Bastille. This outburst had far-reaching effects. The Revolution was now established; the National Assembly's authority was recognized; and the supremacy of Paris was uncontested. In the provinces the result of the fall of the Bastille was seen in a *guerre aux châteaux*. The Revolution spread all over France; the influence of the nobles and gentry was in great measure destroyed. The King and Court could no longer think of a *coup d'état*. The first emigration of the nobles, or, as it might be called, the desertion of the King by the nobles, took place, and Necker was recalled; Bailly, the President of the Assembly, became Mayor of Paris, and Lafayette Commander of the National Guard. For the next few weeks Paris and the country were in a state of anarchy, and the administrative and judicial system of the monarchy broke down completely.

Gradually parties formed themselves in the Assembly. One party, headed by Lally-Tollendal, Mounier, Malouet, and Clermont-Tonnerre, wished to preserve the ancient institutions with possible improvements. Opposed to them were men who drew up the Constitution of 1791, known as

the *Feuillants*, the chief members of which were Duport, Alexandre Lameth, and Barnave. From them gradually separated the men who later formed the extreme Left, such as Robespierre, Pétion, Buzot, and Dubois-Crancé. After the fall of the Bastille the next great days of the Revolution were August 4, when the young nobles, in a frenzy of patriotism, sacrificed all feudal rights; September 10, when it was decided that the Constitution should consist of a king and a single chamber; and October 5 and 6, when a mob from Paris insisted on bringing the King and the Assembly to Paris. It was now quite evident to such men as Mirabeau, who has been described as 'an adventurer of genius in a dissolving society', that the Revolution was likely to lead to a further serious diminution of the royal power.

Many Frenchmen wished to save the country from the crushing preponderance of Paris, and Mirabeau after the removal of the King and the Assembly to Paris was anxious to re-establish a federal system. Early in 1790 he came into communication with the Court, and urged his views as to the right policy to be pursued. Anticipating that civil war in France would shortly take place, he was strongly opposed to supporting Spain in the quarrel with England about Nootka Sound, a harbour on the west of Vancouver Island. Through his efforts the Assembly declared that France would never enter a war for conquest or against freedom. The Bourbon alliance was dissolved, and in November 1790 Spain yielded and made reparation. In January 1791 Mirabeau was elected President of the Assembly; but he died on April 2. Without his steadying influence the King and Queen were persuaded to attempt an escape. The flight to Varennes took place on June 20-21 and failed, with the result that the King lost all his remaining authority. In July the opposition between the

populace of Paris and the bourgeois element was further aggravated by the massacre of the Champ-de-Mars, when Lafayette restored order. On September 4 the King accepted the Constitution, which dealt with administration, the legislature, and the law-courts. France was to have a king with limited powers; it was to be divided into eighty departments; there was to be one Chamber, and local courts were to take the place of the *Parlements*. A State Church had the previous year been formed—all clergy being required to take an oath to the Constitution, while all Church property had been confiscated. On September 4, 1791, the Assembly decreed the annexation of the Pope's territory at Avignon and the Venaissin. August, September, and October 1791 were to prove months of extraordinary importance in the history of the French Revolution.

In August 1791 the Emperor Leopold and Frederick William, King of Prussia, concluded the Declaration of Pillnitz, which stated that, if all the sovereigns of Europe agreed, steps would be taken to restore the King of France to his former position. As there was no possible chance of England, Sardinia, or Naples taking up arms, the Declaration became one of the *comédies augustes* of history. England's neutrality destroyed all the hopes of the *émigrés*. On October 1 the Legislative Assembly met. Owing to one of the most ridiculous resolutions ever passed by a number of educated men, no member of the late Constituent Assembly could sit in the new body. It was dominated by a group of members from the Gironde (Girondists), headed by Brissot, Vergniaud, and Guadet, enthusiastic for revolutionary principles but lacking in any political experience. Though opposed by a Jacobin section, and by a moderate party who for some months held the governmental offices,

these Girondists finally ousted their opponents from office, and early in 1792 were supreme. Hatred of Austria was the key-note of their speeches, which are marked by considerable eloquence, and of which that delivered by Vergniaud on January 13, 1792, in opposition to Robespierre's emphatic anti-war policy, is well worth perusal.

On April 20 Louis XVI declared war upon Austria, and eight days later the French troops suffered a reverse at the hands of the Austrians. The Assembly, which on April 27 had issued a decree against the priests who had not accepted the Civil Constitution, declared against the King's Guard on April 29, and on June 8 ordered the formation of a camp of 20,000 men outside Paris. These decrees, and the King's refusal to accept them, produced a state of chaos; the ministers resigned and a revolution on June 20 was attempted, which gave evidence of the power of the mob, though the invasion of the Tuileries failed. As the King, owing to his firmness on that occasion, was regaining his hold on the better classes, Vergniaud delivered on July 3 a fierce attack on the monarchy.

On July 24 Prussia declared war upon France, and on the 27th the Duke of Brunswick issued his famous manifesto to the French nation. It was published in Paris on August 3 and hastened the fall of the monarchy, which took place on August 10. The French frontier was crossed by the Allies on August 19, and the answer from Paris took the form of the terrible September massacres, followed by the French victory at Valmy. At Valmy was fought what proved to be one of the decisive battles of the world. The outbreak of the French war in April had been followed by the invasion of Poland by Catherine II, who now felt assured of the neutrality of England and the entanglement of Prussia and Austria in the west.

But Prussia was more intent on securing Danzig and Thorn than on restoring the French monarchy, while Austria was resolved, if not able to share with Russia and Prussia the Polish spoils, at any rate to secure territory in Bavaria and Alsace. 'If the French War', writes Dr. Rose, 'worked disaster at Warsaw, the prospect of a partition of Poland undoubtedly helped to lessen the pressure on France during the campaign of Valmy.'

The victory at Valmy was followed by a general French advance towards the Rhine and Belgium. The victory at Jemappes on November 6 seemed but a prelude to the conquest of Holland, and was immediately followed on November 16 by a decree opening the Scheldt to general navigation, by the declaration of November 19 offering 'assistance to all people who wish to recover their liberty', by the annexation on November 27 of Savoy, and on December 15 by the declaration 'that France will treat as an enemy the people which refuses to accept Liberty and Equality, and tolerates its prince and privileged castes'. Pitt who, till the actual entry of England in the war in 1793, was strongly in favour of peace, could not remain silent while the Anglo-Dutch Alliance of 1788 was menaced. On November 16 was published at The Hague Pitt's declaration that England would oppose a French invasion of Holland. The execution of Louis on January 21, 1793, was in no sense a cause of the war between England and France. The rupture had become inevitable, as France persisted in adhering to the November decrees. The opening of the Scheldt, the annexation of Belgium, the threatened occupation of Holland rendered hostilities certain, and on February 1 the French Government declared war upon the English and Dutch nations.

Before many weeks were over France found herself practi-

cally at war against Europe; for the Holy Roman Empire (April), Spain, Portugal, Tuscany, and Naples joined the Allies. Had the greater Powers acted together, or had Pitt thrown 60,000 men into Belgium, France would have been vanquished during the early months of the year. The Girondists, who were in power, proved bad war administrators—the French armies were defeated on March 21 at Neerwinden, and Dumouriez, the Girondist War Minister, fled to the Austrians. After the fall of the Girondists on June 2 a strong Government—the Committee of Public Safety (which numbered among its members Carnot, Robespierre, Lindet, the two Prieurs, Collot d'Herbois, and Billaud-Varennes)—was formed, the army was reorganized, and France entered upon a career of victory which continued almost uninterruptedly till the Treaties of Basel in 1795.

That England failed to check the French successes is a matter of little surprise. No reliance could be placed upon Austria and Prussia, while the loss of Toulon in the autumn (November) of 1793 was inevitable as soon as the French determined to oust the foreign invader. Napoleon's suggestions of the best means of capturing the town had already been brought forward by the Commissioners of the Convention, the Assembly which, elected in 1792, abolished royalty. The defeat of the English at Toulon synchronized with the definite revival of the French military power. Till July 1794 Carnot successfully reorganized the French army and developed a new strategy which, in fact, inaugurated the period of Napoleonic warfare. The results of his work were seen in the victories of Hondschoote (September 8, 1793), Wattignies (October 16, 1793), Fleurus (June 16, 1794), and in the conquest of Holland (December 1794). Before that conquest was effected it had become

evident that there was no longer any need for the stern internal régime of the Committee of Public Safety. And with the opening of 1794 dissensions had broken out among the revolutionists. One section, under Hébert, wished to establish the supremacy of the Commune of Paris, which supported atheism and socialism. In March 1794 Robespierre, with the support of Danton, executed Hébert and suppressed his adherents. On March 30 Robespierre attacked the Dantonists, and Danton, the greatest of the revolutionary leaders, was executed on April 5. He was soon avenged. French territory was now safe, the risings in La Vendée had been suppressed, the royalists had been overthrown, Louis XVI and Marie Antoinette were dead, and the *émigrés* dispersed. On June 26 the battle of Fleurus had placed Belgium definitely in French hands, and the Austrians were driven across the Rhine. France, therefore, being safe from attack, the revolution of Thermidor (July 27-8) took place, and Robespierre perished.

The failure of the Allies was due to various causes. Pitt had, till the outbreak of war, neglected both the army and the navy, and found himself quite unable to defend even Holland. He had heavily subsidized both Austria and Prussia, but his hopes were defeated by the mutual jealousy of these two Powers, due to the Second and Third Partitions of Poland in 1793 and 1795. Early in January 1793 Prussian troops marched into Poland, and the Second Partition was carried out a few months later. Austria had hoped, as a reward for her acquiescence, to secure Bavaria and Alsace, but found that her wish was deeply resented by both Prussia and England, no less than by the ruler of Bavaria, who refused to send troops against France unless the security of his dominions was guaranteed. The result was that, on the Rhine, the Allies

were hampered by jealousy and mutual distrust. In the final partition of Poland Austria and Russia took the lead. Owing to the jealousy existing between Prussia and Austria, France in 1795 had not only reconquered Belgium from Austria, but she had also conquered the United Provinces, which she now named the Batavian Republic. Moreover, Savoy and Nice had been occupied, the Spaniards driven across the Pyrenees, and the Rhine made the French boundary on the east. The Treaty of Basel in April 1795, between the French and Prussian Government, was one result of the thinly veiled antagonism which now definitely marked the relations between the Courts of Berlin and Vienna.

Though Howe had completely defeated the French fleet in the battle of the 1st of June, 1795, and established the supremacy of the British fleet, the French armies remained supreme on the Continent. With the year 1795 France entered upon a new period as regards both her domestic history and her relations with the chief European Powers. The Thermidorians who held the reins of government had, since the fall of Robespierre, definitely returned to the policy of Dumouriez, viz. the separation of Prussia from Austria and the concentration of the French efforts on the Continent upon the subjugation of the Habsburgs. This policy was now expressed in the conclusion of treaties at Basel in 1795. The treaties at Basel included not only one with Prussia, but also others with Holland (May), Spain (July), Holland, Sweden, and Hesse-Cassel (August). Risings in Brittany, instigated by the royalists and supported by England, had also, before the end of the year, been suppressed. With the advent of the Directory to power in November 1795 the remaining active enemies of France were England, Austria, and Sardinia.

The Directory was a somewhat cumbrous form of government which had many defects. For legislation there were two Chambers, called respectively the Council of Ancients (250 in number), of men over 45 years of age, and the Council of Five Hundred ; one-third of each body was to be elected annually. The consent of both Councils was required for a new law, while for the election of a new Director each year the two Councils were to sit together. The executive consisted of five Directors elected by the Ancients out of a list prepared by the Five Hundred ; one Director retiring every year. The Directors could not sit in the Legislative Assemblies. Before this Government was established, it had suffered a fatal blow by the retention in the legislative body of two-thirds of the members of the Convention for the first year, and one-third for the second year.

From 1795 to the *coup d'état* of the 18th Fructidor (Sept. 4), 1797, the foreign policy of the Directory was successful, and at home its attitude was not violently anti-religious. Between 1795 and 1797 there was a remarkable revival of Catholicism in France, the churches at Easter 1796 being crowded ; and during the year some 30,000 parishes resumed their old religion. At the same time the peasants, who had gained in material prosperity, were disinclined to take any steps which might lead to the restoration of the Bourbons. In 1797 it was evident from the elections that the Directors were faced by a hostile Legislature. To keep themselves in power they obtained the assistance of troops under General Augereau, and carried out the *coup d'état* of the 18th Fructidor. After the 18th Fructidor the Directors made a supreme effort to suppress Catholicism by means of a terrible persecution. Religious liberty did not exist during the years 1797-9, and the non-observance of the *Décadi* (the holiday on every

tenth day ordained in the Republican Calendar) was severely punished. Churches in Paris were placed at the disposal of the State, and men were forced to work on Sundays. At the same time life in the country became unendurable owing to the failure of the Government to preserve order and to suppress the numerous bands of brigands who infested the highways. Of the fifty-three deputies condemned to transportation after the *coup d'état* of Fructidor, all escaped except seventeen who were taken under circumstances of great cruelty to Cayenne. In May 1797 the demonetization of the *assignats* and *mandats* (paper-money now practically worthless) took place, and was followed by a forced loan in June and July 1799, while the law calling up all classes of conscripts, and the law of hostages—making prisoners of all relatives of *émigrés*—completed the universal unpopularity of the Jacobin régime. It only required the failure of the Directory's foreign policy to assure its downfall.

During the years 1795, 1796, and 1797 success had attended the French military operations, though at sea the French fleet and those of its allies were defeated. But on land Bonaparte carried out a brilliant campaign in Italy, first forcing the Sardinians in 1796, and then the Austrians in 1797, to make peace. The Treaty of Campo Formio in October 1797 with Austria is of immense importance: it not only made over to Austria the city of Venice, Istria, and Dalmatia, it not only secured for France the Rhine frontier, but, what is of far greater moment, it threw a light on the real aims of Bonaparte. The object of his life, it may be said without exaggeration, was to secure the dominion of India, for the conquest of which Egypt was to be subjugated, Syria invaded, the Ottoman Empire destroyed. The first steps towards the realization of this project were taken in the Treaty of

Campo Formio, by which Bonaparte secured Corfu, Zante, and Cephalonia. He saw no reason why he should not soon acquire Malta and full supremacy in the Mediterranean. In 1798 he embarked on the Egyptian expedition; and though his fleet was destroyed in the battle of the Nile and his troops defeated at Acre, with the result that he was forced to return to Egypt and, in October 1799, to France, he clung to his Oriental project, and in the spring of 1808 was confident that he could carry it out.¹

From 1799 to 1808 events in France and Europe, however, fully occupied his attention and demanded his presence. Of these events the expulsion of the Directors from office and the substitution of a strong government under one man was the first which demanded the exercise of all his energies, and on his return to France Napoleon lost no time in effecting this necessary revolution. During his absence in Egypt the War of the Second Coalition had broken out, at the instance of the Tsar Paul, and a Russian army under Suvórov co-operated with the Austrians in Italy. After suffering defeats in the battles of Stockach, Magnano, Cassano, the Trebbia, and Novi, the French were driven out of Italy. Though Masséna overthrew a Russian army under Korsakov in Switzerland, and though Brune drove an English force out of Holland, the French nation regarded the loss of Italy as an illustration of the ineptitude of the Directors and called for the return of Napoleon.

The 18th Brumaire (November 9, 1799) proved an eventful day in the history of France and, indeed, in the history

¹ Various problems arise out of the Syrian campaign. Was it intended as a step towards the foundation of a vast Eastern Empire, or was it merely an attempt to escape by Constantinople and the Adriatic?

of Europe. The *coup d'état* was carried out on that day, and the Directorate ceased to exist. On the following day all opposition from the Assembly of the Ancients and from that of the Five Hundred came to an end. Owing to the determined action of Lucien Bonaparte at the head of a body of Grenadiers, a new form of government, styled the Consulate, was given to France.

The Consulate and Empire, 1799-1815

BEFORE Napoleon could consider his position secure it was necessary to give France an honourable peace. Consequently in 1800 he entered Italy, and after the battles of Montebello (June 9) and Marengo (June 14) reoccupied the whole of Northern Italy, and re-established the Cisalpine and Ligurian Republics. In Germany Moreau won, on December 3, the battle of Hohenlinden, and Vienna was threatened. On February 9, 1801, the Treaty of Lunéville ended the war. The Rhine was recognized as the French boundary; the Holy Roman Empire was to be reconstructed and the German ecclesiastical principalities secularized. France also acquired Belgium and Luxemburg, and Italy was practically at Napoleon's mercy.

Before the Treaty of Lunéville was actually signed, Napoleon was making a determined attempt, in connexion with the Armed Neutrality of the northern Powers, to overthrow Great Britain and to embark on those Eastern projects which he was, however, not able to attempt till 1808. Russia, Denmark, and Sweden had, curiously enough, shown a complete indifference to the overthrow of Austria or to the possibility of any danger to Europe from the ascendancy of France, and took measures in 1801 to ruin England's trade. Napoleon was thus encouraged to hope that by means of a League against England's commerce he could deal a deadly blow at the prosperity of his one remaining foe. But before the end of March 1801 he realized the futility of all hopes

based on the Northern League; for on March 8 the Danish fleet was defeated in the battle of Copenhagen and in great measure destroyed, while the death of the Tsar Paul, on March 23, caused the immediate dissolution of the League. He hoped, however, that a combined Spanish and French army would bring Portugal to submission and force her to close her ports to English shipping. But to his disappointment the Spaniards made, on June 6, the Treaty of Badajoz with Portugal, which by no means implied the complete submission of the Portuguese.

He still hoped, however, that his Treaty of Florence, made with the King of the Two Sicilies on March 18, and the continuance of his communications with Egypt, would place him in command of the Mediterranean and force Great Britain to make peace. The prospect seemed alluring, for by the Treaty of Florence it was settled that Naples was to exclude from her ports all British and Turkish ships, and 15,000 French troops were to occupy South Italy. Thus communications with Egypt would be facilitated. But Napoleon was to find all his hopes frustrated; on March 21 the combined English and Turkish armies, under General Abercrombie, had won the battle of Alexandria, with the result that on September 2 the French made a convention evacuating Egypt. Thus all Napoleon's plans in 1801—interesting as giving evidence of his deep interests in the East, as is shown by his return to these projects in 1805-8—failed. His action in 1801 proved a rehearsal of his policy after the Treaty of Tilsit. Time was required to prepare armies and fleets to carry out his plans; therefore, he agreed to open negotiations with England, and on March 25, 1802, the Peace of Amiens was concluded.

In the negotiations leading to the treaty Joseph Bonaparte,

the chief French representative, completely outwitted the English envoys, who took it for granted that Napoleon would carry out Article 11 in the Treaty of Lunéville, which provided for the French retirement from Holland as soon as Europe was at peace. Further, they did not stipulate for the renewal of commercial intercourse between France and England, nor did they insist upon the independence of the Helvetic Republic.

The Consulate marked a turning-point not only in the history of France but also in that of Germany and Italy. The influence of the French Revolution made itself felt in both countries, and Napoleon is now recognized as the originator not only of German but also of Italian unity. In 1803, with the meeting of the Diet, the German Revolution began and rapidly progressed under the aegis of Napoleon. In Germany there was no feeling of nationality; this is proved by the readiness of such states as Bavaria, Baden, and Würtemberg to fall in with his scheme for a Confederation of the Rhine. They fought with the French against Austria in 1805 and, as members of the Confederation, against Prussia in 1806. By the resolutions of the Diet in 1803 the Holy Roman Empire had been secularized and Protestantized. In July 1806, Austria having been overthrown at Austerlitz in the previous December, the Confederation of the Rhine was created, and the following month the Holy Roman Empire, which had existed since the year 800, came to an end. Meanwhile Napoleon had, during the period of the Consulate, completely reorganized France and had restored relations with the Papacy by the Concordat which was signed on July 15, 1801, and proclaimed in April 1802.

During the first two months of the year 1803 Napoleon, who was busily engaged in his reorganization of France, does

not seem to have contemplated the early renewal of war with England. For on March 6 he dispatched General Decaen with a small force to the East Indies, and it was not till five days after the departure of the expedition that he realized the possibility of an early outbreak of a war which he had not expected to begin for at least two years. On March 13 he had his famous interview with Lord Whitworth, in which he threatened war unless England withdrew from Malta. Though he evidently still hoped for a continuance of peace, he had already begun to make preparations, in case of war, for invading Hanover, and had taken steps for strengthening his fleet. Napoleon, like many other foreign statesmen before and after his time, had entirely failed to understand the character of the English nation. After the Treaty of Amiens he had checked English trade with France, while Sebastiani's report in January 1803, avowing Napoleon's designs in the East, was in itself a sufficient cause of war.

Seldom if ever has Europe passed through a period so fraught with danger to its future as the period between the Peace of Amiens in March 1802 and the outbreak of war between England and France in May 1803. Had Napoleon refrained from annexations and from acts of veiled hostility to England, and had he withdrawn the French troops from Holland, the coming struggle might have been postponed till he had strengthened his fleet and his general position in a variety of ways. As it was, he was forced into war before he was fully prepared to bring to a successful issue his vast Eastern schemes. The immense influence exercised by British sea power in 1801 ought to have made him realize the necessity of a policy of patience. For that sea power had dispersed the forces of the northern coalition, it retained

control of the Mediterranean, it had reduced Egypt to submission.

On May 18, 1803, Great Britain declared war upon France. The retention by England of Malta, contrary to the arrangement made at Amiens, was simply a natural rejoinder to Napoleon's many infringements of the Treaty of Amiens. These infringements included the annexation of Piedmont, the formation of the kingdom of Etruria and of the Ligurian Republic, and the occupation of Switzerland. But the renewal of the war in 1803 was due entirely to Napoleon's refusal to withdraw from Holland. The prolonged occupation of Holland by the French was the direct cause of the war, just as the fear of French influence in the Low Countries had been one of the determining causes of the Hundred Years' War; it led to the war with France in William III's reign, and to the war of the Spanish Succession. In 1793 England, at war with France, bent her chief efforts to defend Holland and Belgium from conquest by the armies of the Republic. In Elizabeth's reign the fear of the Spanish conquest of Holland had led to war with Spain; in 1914 the German invasion of Belgium, contrary to treaty engagements, at once threw England on the side of France.

No sooner was war declared than Napoleon imprisoned all British subjects who happened to be in France at the time, and both countries pushed on their measures with great energy. Three days later Cornwallis with ten ships of the line took up a position opposite Brest, while Nelson on the *Victory* sailed for the Mediterranean. Napoleon was no less active. In June French forces occupied Hanover, and St. Cyr took possession of Naples, while before the end of the year Napoleon had assured himself of the neutrality of Spain and Portugal. His chief objective was,

however, England ; and till August 1805 the eyes of the world were directed to Boulogne, where an enormous French army was collected. There is no doubt whatever in the minds of competent historians that Napoleon did intend to invade England, just as he had invaded Egypt. But after the defeat of Villeneuve off Cape Finisterre on July 22, 1805, Napoleon was forced to give up the idea of invading England, though it was not till after the battle of Trafalgar that France lost all chance of regaining her lost power at sea. During the years immediately anterior to the battle of Trafalgar Napoleon had not only reorganized France but had assumed the title of Emperor.

The Consulate, indeed, was a period of brilliant legislative achievements. The Constitution which Napoleon set up centralized authority, while the Concordat (an agreement between the government and the Pope) healed religious strife, and the famous Code Napoléon harmonized democratic jurisprudence with the 'tested wisdom of the legists of the monarchy'. Peace had been made with Austria in 1801, and with England in 1802. If France had only been permitted to enjoy even a period of peace for five years, and so had found time for all her energies to be concentrated on civil and colonial enterprises, it is impossible to conjecture what would have been the course of European history. The declaration of war by England in May 1803 came as a blow to Napoleon's plans, though he was himself responsible for the action of England. Since the Treaty of Amiens he had never ceased his aggressive activities in Switzerland, and had annexed Piedmont. He had forbidden the French to trade with England, and, in violation of the terms of the Treaty of Lunéville, he had refused to remove his troops from Holland. England was therefore justified in retaining

possession of Malta and in declaring war upon France in 1803. Napoleon at once occupied Hanover and began preparations for the invasion of England. In March 1804 he murdered the Duc d'Enghien, in May he became Emperor of the French, and in August the Russian Ambassador left Paris, Alexander I being shocked at the execution of d'Enghien. In April 1805 the Third Coalition was formed by England and Russia; it was joined in July by Austria and Sweden, but Prussia persisted in continuing its neutrality. Napoleon, rapidly moving the Grand Army from Boulogne to the Danube, captured Ulm on October 20, and defeated the Russians and Austrians at Austerlitz on December 2. Prussia was then compelled to agree to Napoleon's terms, while Germany was gradually revolutionized. The Treaty of Pressburg, made between France and Austria on December 26, marks the beginning of the Confederation of the Rhine and the end of the Holy Roman Empire. During the next six months Napoleon was chiefly occupied in devising means for carrying out his Eastern projects. The execution of these projects was difficult, for in the previous October the defeat of his fleet at Trafalgar had left England mistress of the seas. In the autumn, however, he was interrupted by the Prussian declaration of war; and after his victory at Jena on October 14, 1806, he issued his First Berlin Decree against British commerce, and definitely began his campaign against Russia.

At Eylau on February 7, 1807, he fought a drawn battle. It was the first time that he had failed to gain a victory. Moreover, the European situation was critical. Turkey was unable to overcome the Russians on the Danube; Austria was arming; the Swedes were marching on Stralsund; England was preparing to send an army to the Baltic; and even Spain was showing signs of independence; in Paris the funds had

fallen. The situation being so critical it was necessary to try diplomatic methods, and accordingly Napoleon opened negotiations with the Prussian King, offering to restore him his lands east of the Elbe. But Frederick William remained true to his Russian ally, and on April 26 signed a Convention at Bartenstein with Alexander, in which the two monarchs invited England, Sweden, Austria, and Denmark to unite with them in opposing Napoleon, and in driving the French from Germany and Italy. Austria, however, refused to join, adopting a position similar to that which she held during the first six months of 1813. She also declined Napoleon's offer of an alliance, and he thereupon used every effort to induce Turkey and Persia to act energetically against Russia. The Shah of Persia was gained, and at the end of April signed a treaty engaging to rouse Afghanistan against England and to attack India. Napoleon, however, had to face the situation in Europe, and he took energetic measures. His army was not only reinforced from France and Italy, but received additional troops from Spain and the German States. He placed a large force on the borders of Austria, and he strengthened the troops which were besieging Danzig. On June 14, 1807, he defeated the Russian army at Friedland, and the following day, with true prophetic instinct, he wrote to Josephine to say that the battle of Friedland would be as celebrated as that of Marengo. Before many days were over Alexander expressed a desire to treat, and on June 22 was signed the Treaty of Tilsit between France and Russia. It was followed by a treaty on July 9 between France and Prussia. Both England and Austria must share the blame for Alexander's change of front. England, occupied with party struggles, sent troops to the Baltic after the treaty had been signed, while the Austrian envoy offering Alexander

assistance also arrived too late. Up to the Peace of Tilsit Napoleon had conferred immense benefits upon Europe. He had swept away the antiquated system of the Holy Roman Empire, had opened the way for the establishment of national monarchies, and had awakened a spirit of patriotism in Germany. Italy especially owes a deep debt of gratitude to Napoleon, for her determination to achieve unity was roused, though it was not satisfied till the sixties. Did Napoleon, when he advocated the total extinction of the Prussian kingdom, dimly foresee that she would some sixty years later stamp upon all Germany a military system which is now (1918) a menace to Europe?

The way now, however, seemed clear for Napoleon to revert to his original scheme—French domination in the Mediterranean and the invasion of India. The terms of the Treaty of Campo Formio in 1797 and the Egyptian expedition had already indicated the chief object of Napoleon's foreign policy. After the Treaties of Tilsit Napoleon lost no time in preparing for the overthrow of England in the East. Denmark, Sweden, and Portugal were to be forced to join the continental system, and the last-named Power was to be partitioned. At the beginning of September, however, the Danish fleet was seized by Canning, while in December the Portuguese fleet and all English merchantmen in the Tagus escaped from capture by Junot, who had arrived at Lisbon on November 30. The flight of the Portuguese Court to Brazil had results of immense importance. The Marquis of Buckingham, in a letter to Lord Grenville, writes that 'it is *certain* that Junot and his army were expected in the south-west of Ireland about Christmas Day'. Had the Prince of Brazil delayed his departure, 'Junot would have found the means from the Brazil ships, all victualled and watered, to

have embarked 25,000 French and Spanish troops under the protection of the Portuguese nine and the Russian seven ships, forming a force of sixteen sail, sufficient to have forced Sir S. Smith's nine ships from their blockade; and in that case we should have heard of that event and of Junot's appearance in Bantry Bay at the same moment'.¹ As it turned out, Junot was to find himself seven months later being conveyed by sea, not to Ireland, but to France.

Napoleon was forced to recognize, in December 1807, that he could not use the Danish fleet and that his Portuguese policy had failed. Regardless of these two blows to his plans, he busied himself in Italy during the early months of 1808 in establishing his supremacy in that country. With Spain under his control the Mediterranean would be in his hands and an important step towards the realization of his Eastern projects would have been taken. In order to become master of the Mediterranean it was absolutely necessary for Napoleon to have Spain wholly submissive. Had Napoleon been content to recognize the Bourbon dynasty in Spain, and had he been careful not to meddle with the religion of the inhabitants, it is more than probable that the task of overthrowing the French supremacy in Europe would have been infinitely more difficult than it proved. Fortunately for Europe Napoleon, arrogant and flushed with success, made the most serious mistake in his life, and entered upon a course which brought ruin to all his schemes.

On April 14, 1808, Napoleon arrived at the Château de Marrac at Bayonne, which he only left after a sojourn of three months. These three months proved to be the turning-point in his career. Owing to an insurrection Charles IV of Spain had abdicated in favour of his son Ferdinand. At

¹ Hist. MSS. Commission (MSS. at Drogheda), vol. ix, p. 165.

Bayonne the miserable Ferdinand resigned in favour of his father, only to find that the latter had handed the crown of Spain to Napoleon. After this forced abdication the Spanish family went into exile at Valençay, leaving Napoleon apparently master of the destinies of Spain. Over the kingdom of Naples, now vacated by Joseph who was given the Spanish throne, Napoleon placed his brother-in-law, Joachim Murat. Taking it for granted that Spain was willing to accept a ruler at Napoleon's hands, it would at first sight appear that no better king could probably have been found than Joseph Bonaparte. He had shown singular powers as a diplomatist at both Lunéville and Amiens, of which latter treaty Joseph spoke as 'my Peace'. Aided by his minister, Roederer, Joseph had ruled Naples well, sweeping away feudal abuses, restoring order in the finances, and transferring the burden of taxation from the poor to the rich. As, however, it turned out, Napoleon's choice was unfortunate, for Joseph never showed any marked ability in Spain. Lucien Bonaparte, or even Murat, would probably have had more chance of success, supposing that the Spanish nation had forgiven the perfidy of Bayonne. Lucien had more energy than Joseph, his oratory was more impressive, and in all probability he would not have attempted to command armies.

Joseph himself resented his removal to Spain, and Napoleon soon found that the transference of his brother to Madrid had unexpected results. Joseph entered the Spanish capital on July 20, but already risings were taking place all over the country, and on July 14 the French General Dupont had been forced to surrender some 22,000 French and Swiss troops to a Spanish army at Baylen. On August 21, 1808, Junot, after a skirmish at Roliça, was defeated by an English army at Vimiero, and on August 30 signed the Convention of

Cintra, surrendering unconditionally, but being allowed to leave Portugal. The only success gained by the French was the capture of Saragossa on August 13 after a siege of two months. September found Spain, south of the Ebro, freed from the French incubus. For Napoleon the situation was serious, and in striking contrast to the position in the spring of the year. In view of his intended attack upon India he had established firmly his hold upon Italy, and had annexed Rome and the greater part of the Papal States to his Empire. Six months later the situation had undergone a dramatic change : Joseph had fled from Madrid, and the check to Napoleon's plans had important effects on European politics. In Austria the growth of national feeling was evident, while the Tsar was far from being satisfied with the results of the Treaty of Tilsit.


Napoleon had now for the first time in his European experiences met with not only a national but also with a religious resistance. The opposition of Spain to the establishment of a French ruler in Madrid was principally a religious opposition. In attacking Spain Napoleon was attacking Catholicism, and the resistance to him was encouraged by the Spanish priests. Napoleon had no appreciation of what religion meant. He had hitherto used it in France in order to gain political ends, and his manner of dealing with it in this case illustrates his complete failure to comprehend the strength of religion or the possibility of religious feeling developing into fanaticism. As he afterwards admitted, in Spain his career was shipwrecked. In the autumn of 1808, however, Napoleon was resolved at all costs to suppress the opposition in Spain to his policy ; and in order to prevent any outbreak in Central Europe while he was carrying out his plan for the subjugation of Spain, he opened fresh negotiations

with Alexander. It was arranged that they should meet at Erfurt. That meeting took place in September 1808, and a convention between the two monarchs was arranged on October 12. In order to secure Alexander's support in case of the outbreak of war between France and Austria, Napoleon was forced to adopt a tone very different from that which marked his negotiations at Tilsit. But he was bent on the great task on which he had set his mind—the expulsion of the English from the Mediterranean and from India. The wars with Prussia and Russia had so far postponed the execution of his plan; and he now feared that, unless he could rely upon Russia, his Eastern projects might still further be interfered with by a war with Austria. Though he was far from certain of securing Russia's aid in the event of a war with the Habsburgs, he resolved to crush Spain without any delay. He moved troops from Prussia to reinforce the army on the Spanish frontier, and early in November he was at the front. After some decisive victories he entered Madrid on December 4. Sir John Moore's famous diversion, however, saved Lisbon; for Napoleon decided to follow and destroy Moore's force. At Astorga he left Soult to carry on the pursuit, and leaving Spain on January 17, 1809, he arrived in Paris six days later to find, as he expected, that Austria was contemplating hostilities, and that Talleyrand had been conspiring against him.

During the previous months Stadion had hoped that Austria would be supported by Prussia. But the King of Prussia, acting against the wish of his people, persisted in remaining neutral, while, on the other hand, Alexander, though bound by treaty obligations to Napoleon, made no serious attempt to hamper the Austrians. On April 9 Austria declared war. In the battle of Aspern—a soldiers' battle—

Napoleon suffered a severe reverse. Unfortunately the Archduke Charles made no attempt to follow up his success. Had he done so he might have annihilated the French army as it lay huddled together without ammunition on the island of Lobau. As it was, the effect of Aspern upon Europe was magical. Risings took place in the Tyrol and in Germany; England embarked on the Walcheren expedition; the resistance to the French in Spain acquired new vigour. But on July 6 and 7 Napoleon defeated the Archduke in the battle of Wagram. By the Treaty of Schönbrunn, on October 14, Austria suffered heavy territorial losses, and by the cession of Trieste to Napoleon was cut off from the Adriatic. But the war proved a serious hindrance to Napoleon's Eastern schemes, for it had become evident that he could no longer rely upon Russia for active support in the furtherance of those schemes. Moreover, his conduct to the Pope Pius VII—who in July 1809 had been carried off, a prisoner, to Grenoble (the Papal States being annexed to the French Empire)—strengthened the religious opposition to him, not only in Spain but also in France. It was not, however, till the refusal of the Tsar to agree to Napoleon's marriage with the Archduchess Anne (his divorce from Josephine being effected in January 1810) that the French Emperor realized that he must defer his Eastern projects until he had defeated Russia. Nevertheless, at the time of his second marriage in March 1810 Napoleon's Empire in Europe seemed to be firmly established. His brothers were ruling in Spain, Westphalia, and Holland, a brother-in-law governed Naples, a stepson Northern Italy, and a sister Tuscany. The rulers of Bavaria, Baden, and Würtemberg were closely allied to him by marriage.

In March 1810 his marriage with Marie Louise, the Austrian



Archduchess, took place, and had he at once proceeded to Spain a very critical situation for both the Spaniards and the English would have been created. Fortunately he devoted his attention to carrying out the 'continental' system (exclusion of English goods from the Continent), by which he hoped to ruin England. His brother Louis having shown a reluctance to adhere to that system in Holland, where he was King, Napoleon had not only deposed him in July 1810 but had incorporated all the countries bordering on the North Sea as far as Elbe with his Empire. This Grand Empire was simply a coalition against England, but the foundations of that Empire were unsound. On December 31, 1810, Alexander, irritated at Napoleon's seizure of Oldenburg, held by a Russian prince, declared that he had resolved to modify the strictness of the continental system. 'That', said Napoleon, 'is the leak that is sinking the ship.' War with Russia was then determined upon, Napoleon intending, when he had forced the Tsar to submit to him, to settle matters in Spain. Everything therefore hung upon the success of the Russian campaign.

The year 1811 was occupied by Napoleon in elaborate preparations for that campaign. Nor did Alexander fail to make similar preparations. Sweden joined Russia, and Russia, in 1812, made the Treaty of Bucharest with Turkey. Napoleon secured military assistance from both Austria and Prussia; on June 23 his mixed forces crossed the Niemen, and after some severe battles entered Moscow on September 14. During these months the weakness of the French position in Spain had been demonstrated, and on July 12 Wellington had won the battle of Salamanca and had temporarily occupied Madrid. On October 15 the French retreat from Moscow began, and the disastrous passage of the

Beresina took place on November 26-8. The expedition had proved a stupendous failure, and on December 30 York, the Prussian general, signed the Convention of Tauroggen with Russia. This convention marked a turning-point in Prussian, as indeed in European, history. On February 26, 1813, the Treaty of Kalisch united the fortunes of the Russian and Prussian rulers, and the declaration of war upon Napoleon by the Prussian King on March 16 marked the opening of the War of Liberation. The wisdom of the military reforms of the Prussian Scharnhorst was clearly evident during the campaign, and they proved of inestimable value throughout the year. In April Napoleon entered Germany with a new army, and on May 2 fought the battle of Lützen, one result of which was that Dresden became the French head-quarters, and Saxony the French ally. Though Napoleon won the battle of Bautzen on May 20 and 21, the Russians and Prussians were by no means crushed, and simply retired in fairly good order.

On June 4 the Armistice of Pläswitz (Poichwitz) was signed; and till August 10 the Prussian and Russian rulers occupied themselves in reorganizing their armies. Jomini pronounced the armistice to be the greatest blunder in Napoleon's career, and so it proved. But at the time Napoleon had many good reasons for granting the armistice. The Prussian and Russian armies were still intact and were holding together. Moreover, his cavalry required thorough reorganization and was, he hoped, shortly to be reinforced from Spain. It must also be remembered that he had as yet no fortified *dépôt* to serve as a base for further military operations. Dresden had no fortifications worth the name, and though in May he had begun the construction of defences, more time was required to make the city into a fortress. His true policy was undoubtedly to have conceded Austria's

terms, the chief of which were the extinction of the Grand Duchy of Warsaw and of the Confederation of the Rhine, the restoration of Prussia to its position before the battle of Jena, and of the Illyrian Provinces to Austria. He could then have inflicted a decisive defeat on Russia and Prussia, and concluded a general peace restoring Ferdinand VII to the Spanish throne. He would thus have been in a position to renew the war whenever he decided that it would be advantageous to do so. But in spite of the defeat of Vittoria, which took place on June 21, and the news of which reached Napoleon at the end of the month, he persisted in underestimating the strength of Austria. That Power had agreed at Reichenbach on June 27 to join the Allies if Napoleon refused her terms and remained convinced that he could not only reconquer the north of Spain but could defeat the three great military Powers in Germany. The armistice, notable for Napoleon's negotiations with Metternich and their failure, ended on August 10. He had meanwhile instructed Davout, his ablest general in Germany, to concentrate all his efforts to complete the fortifications of Hamburg, to build an arsenal and dockyard, and to begin the construction of a fleet. Davout was then to drive back the Swedes and to relieve the French garrison at Stettin. Napoleon, still convinced of the weakness of the Habsburg military power and of the superiority and efficiency of his own troops, now found himself in the half-fortified Dresden exposed to the attacks of the coalition, which included Russia, Prussia, Austria, and Sweden. The first few weeks after the expiration of the armistice brought disaster to the French cause. On August 23 Bernadotte at the head of a Swedish army defeated Oudinot, whose base was Wittenberg and who was marching on Berlin, at Gross-Beeren; and though Napoleon won the battle

of Dresden on August 26 and 27 his general, Macdonald, suffered on August 26 a crushing defeat at the hands of Blücher on the Katzbach. Four days later, on August 30, Vandamme's army was practically destroyed at Kulm, and on September 6 Ney, who had superseded Oudinot, was defeated at Dennewitz.

These defeats show that the majority of Napoleon's generals, though capable of directing army corps, were not fit for the command of armies. The story of 1813 is 'essentially the story of the failure of the Marshals'. While Metternich and Stein were, in September, discussing at Töplitz the future of Germany, the victorious armies of the Allies were slowly advancing. Fighting was almost incessant during the first three weeks of October, culminating in the total defeat of Napoleon in the battle of Leipzig (October 16-18). During their retreat to France, the French troops were attacked at Hanau (October 29-31) by the Bavarians, whose king on October 8 had made with the Allies the Treaty of Ried, by which his sovereignty was recognized. At the same time the Allies undertook to restore lawful princes to their estates with 'unreserved sovereignty'. These arrangements, initiated by Metternich, secured the supremacy of Austria in Germany till the war of 1866, and checked the unification of that country. Austria, paramount in Germany, was content to compensate herself in Italy, where she remained the predominant Power till the Italian War of Independence in 1859.

At Frankfort on November 9 the Allies, among whom was a strong peace party, offered Napoleon most generous terms. But the French Emperor, relying, with some reason, upon dissensions among the Allies and the dissolution of the coalition, would not accept their proposals. The Allies,

who should after the battle of Leipzig have pressed rapidly forward and thus saved Europe from the expensive campaign of 1814, acted with hesitation and only advanced into France early in January. Till March 30, when Marmont agreed to an armistice to save Paris from a bombardment, Napoleon carried out a most brilliant campaign. He was aided by dissensions among the Allies, which, however, were checked by the arrival of the English Foreign Minister, Lord Castlereagh, early in February at Châtillon, by the Treaty of Chaumont on March 1 between the four Powers, and later in the month by the Austrian Emperor's realization of Napoleon's duplicity. The latter's defeat on March 20 at Arcis-sur-Aube decided his overthrow. After the arrival of the Allies in Paris Napoleon was deposed by the French Senate on April 2; he himself abdicated on April 11, and was sent to Elba.

The Bourbons were now restored, and on May 3 Louis XVIII, the brother of Louis XVI, unfettered by any promise to establish a liberal constitution, entered the French capital. The First Treaty of Paris was concluded on May 30. It conceded to France the limits of 1792, and all her lost colonies except the Mauritius, Tobago, St. Lucia, and the Seychelles. 'It is better', said Lord Castlereagh in Parliament, 'for France to be commercial and therefore pacific, than a warlike and conquering State.'

The downfall of Napoleon was celebrated in England in June, when a number of crowned heads and generals visited London, Oxford, and Ascot. In the autumn the Congress of Vienna met, and its proceedings would seem to justify Napoleon's decision to refuse the terms offered him at Frankfort in November of the previous year. He still with reason relied on dissensions breaking out among the

Allies, and at the close of 1814 it seemed that his anticipations would be realized and that the dissensions would develop into a European War. That his expectations were not realized was in great measure owing to the influence of Castlereagh with Alexander. However, the mere possibility of divisions among the Allies, together with the failure of the reinstated Bourbons to acquire any popularity in France, decided Napoleon to endeavour to regain his kingdom. On March 1 he landed near Cannes, and on March 20 entered Paris.

His return from Elba to France certainly cannot be described as a thunder-clap upon the Powers. After Christmas 1814 a descent from Elba was regarded by all the European sovereigns, except perhaps Louis XVIII, as imminent. Owing to their disputes and conflicting interests the Allies were unable to take any adequate action to prevent Napoleon's escape from Elba; and there was great satisfaction in Vienna when it was known that he had landed in France and not in Italy, where he might have 'un-chained' that Revolution which Austria feared so much and which consequently was postponed till the days of Cavour. It was not till late in May 1815 that war with Napoleon was decided upon by the English Government, and its hesitation was regarded on the Continent with much disfavour. At last, on May 22 the Prince Regent, in his message to Parliament, announced that war was probable, and the European alliance against Napoleon was cemented. Meanwhile, Napoleon had continued his endeavours, without much success, to secure the support of all parties in France. The Additional Act had promised political and civil liberty to all, but it roused no enthusiasm. However, Napoleon believed that his victory over the Allies would reconcile both the Constitutionalists and the Jacobins to his rule.

The military situation in 1815 was not unlike that of 1796. In both cases the armies of his opponents, if united, would outnumber him. In 1796 he not only overthrew the Sardinian army before it could join the Austrians, but forced the King of Sardinia to make peace. In 1815, however, after the battle of Ligny on June 16, though he drove back Blücher and the Prussians, he failed to prevent them from coming at an opportune moment to the assistance of Wellington at Waterloo on the afternoon of June 18. After the battle Paris was occupied by the Allies, and Napoleon took refuge on a British man-of-war, and died a few years later on the island of St. Helena. The atrocities committed by Blücher and the Prussians on their march to Paris were somewhat similar to those committed in 1914-17 in Belgium and France.

With the battle of Waterloo ended the second Hundred Years' War between Great Britain and France. Though disputes have arisen between the two countries, chiefly with regard to the colonial aspirations of France, no war has since broken out between the two countries, which are now closely allied.

*The Second Restoration, the Orleans Monarchy,
and the Revolution of 1848. 1815-52*

THE period of the Second Restoration extends from June 24, 1815, to July 29, 1830. Louis XVIII, before he returned to Paris, had formed a ministry which included Talleyrand and Fouché, and had issued a constitution which left considerable power in the hands of the King. In August a general election took place, Talleyrand's ministry resigned, and in September a cabinet was formed which included the Ducs de Richelieu and Decazes, and which distinguished itself by acts of violence. Ney was shot in December, and some fifty-seven persons who had joined Napoleon in the Hundred Days were proscribed. In the south of France, meanwhile, an outbreak of royalist violence known as 'The White Terror' had taken place. On November 20 the Second Treaty of Paris finally settled the question of the French frontier, and arranged that certain French fortresses should be occupied for five years by Allied troops and that all works of art taken from foreign countries should be restored. Richelieu could now devote himself to the business of internal affairs, which, owing to the action of the *Chambre introuvable*—composed mainly of 'ultras'—required careful management. In the early months of 1816 it became evident that the Chamber was determined to undo the entire work of the Revolution, and the law of amnesty, passed on January 12, exiled, notwithstanding its title, all the members of the National Convention who had voted for Louis XVI's death.

During 1816 and 1817, however, the moderate party

gradually increased its influence, especially after September 5, 1816, when the *Chambre introuvable* was dissolved. In the new elections the ministry was supported, and on February 17, 1817, a new electoral law was passed. In December 1818 the Duc de Richelieu resigned, and General Dessoles and Decazes formed a new ministry. Richelieu's period of office had seen the position of France much improved both at home and in its relations with foreign Powers. The Tsar and the King of Prussia had visited Louis in the previous October; and in consequence of a decision of the Powers at the Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle the occupation of French territory by foreign troops had come to an end in November. The army had been reorganized, and France was now relieved from the surveillance of the Committee of the Powers, and 're-admitted to the comity of Europe'. The new Dessoles Government was from its formation faced with immense difficulties. A group of constitutional royalists known as the Doctrinaires, and including in its ranks such men as Guizot, Barante, and Royer-Collard, aimed at a definitely Liberal policy which agreed with the view of Dessoles. In May 1819 the ministry recognized the freedom of the press, an act which alarmed the ultra-royalists, and even moderates like de Serre, who with the approval of Decazes brought forward an electoral law to establish an hereditary House of Peers and to hold elections for the Chamber of Deputies every seven years. In November Dessoles, Saint-Cyr, and Baron Louis left the ministry, and Decazes became Chief Minister.

On February 14, 1820, the measure was to be introduced, when suddenly the whole political situation was changed by the assassination of the Duke of Berry, son of the Comte d'Artois. The political situation in France was in an instant revolutionized; on February 20 Decazes was dismissed,

much to the regret of Louis ; Richelieu formed his second ministry, and an electoral law was passed in June which gave political preponderance to the large landowners. In the autumn the new Chamber contained a large proportion of royalist deputies, and the ministry was reinforced by such men as Villèle, who had strong royalist leanings, and who succeeded Richelieu as Prime Minister in December. Villèle's accession to the chief office marks the opening of a fresh period. He chose for his colleagues men of uncompromising royalist tendencies, such as Corbière, de Peyronnet, and Mathieu de Montmorency, and his Government lasted till the beginning of 1828. In many ways his ministry was a notable one. In the first place, the European position gave cause for much anxiety. Revolutions had broken out in Greece and Spain, the affairs of both countries being discussed at the Congress of Verona in October, 1822. France was naturally desirous of taking a prominent part in the operations proposed by Russia, Prussia, and Austria, and as England refused to accept the views of these Powers with regard to 'concerted interference' in Spain, a French army in 1823 invaded the Spanish peninsula and restored Ferdinand, and remained there till 1827. At home the Government had steadily pursued a reactionary policy, passing severe laws, restricting the freedom of the press, and placing education in the hands of the clergy. Till 1824, however, the question of a forward foreign policy was continually urged upon Villèle, who, anxious to establish firmly the royal and ministerial position at home, dismissed in June Chateaubriand, the representative of the ultra-warlike party. To Villèle the chief question, now that the French finances were on a sound footing and the prosperity of the country assured, was the compensation of the *émigrés* who had suffered during the

Revolution. On September 15 Louis XVIII died, and was succeeded by the Comte d'Artois as Charles X.

Charles X, whose wife was Maria Theresa, daughter of Victor Amadeus III of Savoy, was by nature honest and bigoted. He had emigrated from France after the fall of the Bastille, and for many years had lived in England. He was in character somewhat like James II of England, being sincere in his opinions and having 'absolute' ideas which he was determined to enforce. He was, like Villèle, resolved to compensate the *émigrés*, to whom in 1825 the enormous sum of £40,000,000 was voted, while the control of religious houses was placed in the discretion of the Crown, thus closely uniting the Church with the Bourbon dynasty. The opponents of Villèle, however, strengthened by the signs of popular discontent in the provinces, continued to attack him, and, the elections of November 1827 proving unfavourable to his ministry, which was defeated in the Chambers, he resigned on December 5. Charles seems at first to have realized the seriousness of the situation, for the appointment of the Martignac ministry was followed by certain measures calculated to appease the Liberals. The Press Law was modified, and the operations of the Jesuits were restricted. But the result of these half-measures was similar to that produced in England by Wellington's Catholic Relief Bill in 1829. The extreme royalists were alienated, the Liberals were not conciliated. Martignac's policy of balancing, like that of the Duke of Wellington, proved a failure.

In July 1829 new elections were held, Martignac was dismissed, and the Prince de Polignac formed a ministry on royalist and reactionary lines. It was evident that a serious effort was to be made in order to divert public attention from internal questions. Polignac, a minister as short-sighted and

as obstinate as the King, adopted a forward foreign policy and prepared an expedition which, early in 1830, captured Algiers. This success, it is said, following on the battle of Navarino in 1827, 'intoxicated Charles with a prospect of military glory'. He seems to have thought that nothing could be denied him, and on July 25, 1830, he signed the famous Five Ordinances, suspending the liberty of the press, declaring the Chamber dissolved, raising the property qualification, summoning a new Chamber in September, and appointing to the Council of State a number of reactionaries. Two days later (on July 27) the Revolution of Three Days took place; on August 1 Charles abdicated in favour of his grandson, the Duc de Bordeaux, and escaped to England. On August 7 the French Chambers raised Louis Philippe, Duke of Orleans, to the throne.

The establishment of the Orleans dynasty, in the person of Louis Philippe, on the throne of France signified, as did the accession of William III to the throne of England, the end of government by divine right. Like the Reform Movement in England in 1831, it represented a middle-class victory; and in both countries there was during the ensuing years some difficulty in restraining the popular forces, by means of which the Reform Bill and the accession of Louis-Philippe had been brought about. In France the July Revolution has been well described as a triumph for the *Doctrinaire* Liberals, such as Lafayette, Thiers, and Guizot. Louis Philippe's position was never a strong one, for he represented the opinions of the *bourgeoisie* and not of the whole people of France. As soon as the support of the middle classes was withdrawn the Orleanist monarchy fell. Before he had been on the throne a month a revolution took place in Belgium, its separation from Holland was declared on November 17, and it was resolved

that a monarchy should be set up. The Tsar of Russia at once proposed to intervene; but luckily a rising in Poland in November kept him fully occupied for several months, and by the time it was crushed the Belgian question was settled. In that settlement France and England acted together, and Louis Philippe showed wisdom in declining the Belgian crown for the Duc de Nemours, his second son. In June 1831 Leopold of Saxe-Coburg was elected King of the Belgians, his kingdom being declared neutral under the guarantee of the Powers. Till the capture of Antwerp in December 1832 by the French fleet, William I of Holland resisted the decision of the Powers.

Meanwhile Louis Philippe had acted judiciously. Lafayette, the leader of the advanced Liberal party, was his first Chief Minister till March 1831, when he was succeeded by Casimir-Périer, who formed a strong Government, with a strong foreign policy. He reorganized the army, initiated schemes for the improvement of education, insisted on the preservation of order at home. In May 1832 he died, and for a time there was considerable disorder in France, due partly to the attempt of the Duchesse de Berri to raise La Vendée in the cause of the Legitimists. In October Louis Philippe, who was personally in favour of absolutism, found himself compelled to form a Coalition Ministry under Marshal Soult. It included Thiers as Minister of the Interior, the Duc de Broglie as Foreign Minister, and Guizot as Minister of Education, who in the following year introduced a system of elementary schools. This ministry showed itself capable and resolute. It suppressed riots and strikes, and quickly put down an attempted insurrection in Paris in 1835. On a question of foreign policy on which the King differed with his ministers, Soult resigned in February 1836, and Thiers

formed a ministry, and at once showed activity in foreign affairs. Not finding himself supported by the King, he resigned in August, and Guizot, with Count Molé as Minister of Foreign Affairs, carried on the Government. Very important events took place under this ministry. Success attended Molé's support of the Algerian enterprise, and in October Constantine was captured. In April 1839, by the Treaty of London, the Belgian question was finally and satisfactorily settled, England, France, Austria, Prussia, and Russia recognizing the new kingdom as an independent neutral state. Early that year a ministry headed by Soult succeeded that of Guizot and Molé; but in February the following year, on the Chamber refusing to grant a fixed revenue for the Duc de Nemours, it resigned.

On March 1 Thiers became head of a new ministry and Minister of Foreign Affairs. His term of office fell during an exciting period in French foreign policy. Since 1839 the East had occupied the attention of Europe owing to the ambition of Mehemet Ali, the ruler of Egypt; and on July 15, 1840, the Treaty of London bound Russia, England, Austria, and Prussia in an agreement to support the Sultan and to expel Mehemet's army from Syria. France, on the contrary, was anxious to support Mehemet, and at one time it seemed that she would declare war upon England. But in July of the following year France consented to become a partner to the Treaty of London, and the danger of war disappeared. During the crisis the Guizot administration had been formed (October 20, 1840) and it remained in office for the remainder of the reign of Louis Philippe. Under this administration the monarchy of July grew steadily more and more unpopular, while by its attitude in the *affaire* of the Spanish marriages it alienated England. At the beginning of 1848 the Orleans monarchy seemed

stable, but it had no democratic basis ; in reality its only support was the *bourgeoisie*, and that support had for various reasons weakened. The foreign policy of the King had not brought any glory to France, England since 1846 was definitely alienated, and throughout 1847 it was apparent that the Government had no strong supporters in the country. Moreover, the influence of Saint-Simon, Fourier, and other socialists had furthered the growth of democratic ideas among the working classes, while the moderate Liberals had been alienated by the refusal to grant the smallest measure of electoral reform.

In 1847 banquets had been given in furtherance of parliamentary reform and democratic revolution, and such men as Odilon Barrot, the leader of the parliamentary Radicals, had come prominently forward. On February 22, 1848, the army and the National Guard refused Guizot's request that they would suppress a disturbance in Paris caused by the Government's prohibition of a political banquet in Paris. The following day Louis Philippe dismissed Guizot, hoping to pacify the opponents of the ministry. On the night of February 23 the King reluctantly placed Thiers at the head of the Government, agreeing to his demand for the summoning of a new Assembly resting on a wider franchise. But at the same time he insisted on the appointment of General Bugeaud as Minister of War, whose threatening action towards the Parisian insurgents destroyed all hopes of a peaceful solution of the situation. Deserted by his army and the National Guard, Louis 'abandoned his ministers, his family, and himself on February 24, 1848'.¹

The revolution in France, which had been accomplished so rapidly, followed quite unintentionally the revolution in

¹ *Cambridge Modern History*, vol. xi, p. 101.

Italy which had broken out in Palermo on January 12. The news of the revolution in France encouraged the Italians, and its influence was immediately felt in Germany, Austria, Hungary, Bohemia, and Prussia. It immediately developed on socialist lines, and Louis Blanc secured on February 25 the establishment of national workshops, and a few days later a socialist Commission was set up at the Luxembourg. During March and the early days of April Paris was in disorder owing to the violence of the socialist mob. On April 16 the bourgeois Guard attacked the mob, and the National Convention which met shortly afterwards showed vigour. The national workshops were closed, and General Cavaignac, at the head of the National Guard, crushed the socialists in a battle in Paris which lasted from June 24 to June 26. In November a Constitution was published. The principle of universal suffrage was recognized, and it was settled that a President of the Republic should be elected for four years, also by universal suffrage. At the elections in December Louis Napoleon, son of the King of Holland, was elected President. Europe was in 1848 passing through the throes of a general revolution, and at one time it seemed that the Austrian monarchy would come to an end. It was not till 1849 that the reactionary forces proved victorious, nor till the Convention of Olmütz with Prussia that Austria was again established as the leading German Power. But the two men who had emerged in conspicuous fashion above the level of the rest were the Emperor Nicholas and Louis Napoleon. The former, by the valuable aid which he gave the Habsburgs in reducing Hungary, had practically set Austria on its feet again, while Louis Napoleon by the *coup d'état* of December 1, 1851, had prepared the way for the proclamation of the Empire on December 2, 1852.

Napoleon III, 1852-1870

Most of the European Powers willingly recognized the new ruler of France; but the Tsar, after an interval, only did so in a modified manner, with the result that Napoleon eagerly seized the first opportunity for retaliation. That opportunity was soon afforded by the growing importance of the Eastern question. Early in 1853 Nicholas, who was convinced that the early break up of the Ottoman Empire was to be expected, demanded the maintenance of the *status quo* in the matter of the Holy Places (thus refusing to entertain the French demands), and the acknowledgement of Russia's right to give protection to the Orthodox subjects of the Sultan (which meant the deprivation of the Sultan's sovereignty over half his European subjects).

On October 22, 1853, the French and British fleets passed the Dardanelles; on January 3, 1854, they entered the Black Sea; and on March 27 the two Powers declared war upon Russia. Neither Prussia nor Austria took part in the struggle, but in January 1855 Sardinia joined the Allies at the instance of Cavour, and 15,000 Italian troops landed in the Crimea. On March 2, 1855, the Emperor Nicholas died, and on September 8 Sebastopol, after a long siege, was taken. The French army had covered itself with glory, and from that time Napoleon favoured peace negotiations. On March 30, 1856, the Treaty of Paris ended the war.

The close of the Crimean War found Austria isolated, and suffering from serious financial weakness. On August 18,

1855, she had made a Concordat with the Papacy, promising the restoration of the ecclesiastical estates confiscated by Joseph II, and giving the supervision of schools to the bishops and clergy. Russia, aggrieved at her attitude during the Crimean War, was no longer her ally, and her relations with Prussia were far from friendly. Consequently when, owing to the efforts of Cavour, the Italian question came forward, Austria found herself without allies. No sooner was the Crimean War over than Cavour redoubled his efforts to bring about the union of Italy under Piedmont, thus anticipating by a few years the policy of Bismarck with regard to the union of Germany. All hope of success depended on the attitude of France, which was regarded as the most formidable of the Powers. The peace of Europe apparently depended on the will of Napoleon, who was known to sympathize in a general way with the spirit of nationality. At this time, and till in 1861 Italy had practically gained unity, he apparently intended to aid Cavour in creating a confederation of Italian princes under the leadership of the Pope and the King of Sardinia. He felt, too, the necessity of careful consideration before taking any definite step; for the French elections of 1857 had produced a small opposition, the growing strength of which had induced him to introduce some changes in his system of government.

Moreover, it was evident that the policy of Cavour implied opposition on his part to the cause of the Papacy, with which Napoleon wished to keep on good terms, especially as the attitude of religious France and of the Empress was distinctly pro-Papal. Besides, the French Foreign Office held the traditional view that it was in the interests of France to have weak neighbours; and if Austria was occupying the States of the Church, French troops were holding Rome

itself for the Pope. While he was thus hesitating, Orsini made an attempt on his life on January 14, 1858. As Orsini had arrived in Paris from England the hostile feelings of the Parisians against that country were aroused. A famous cartoon in *Punch* represents a number of French colonels urging the Emperor to lead them against *la perfide Albion*. The actual results of Orsini's attack were, however, startling. Instead of breaking off all negotiations with Cavour, the Emperor consented to meet him at Plombières on July 20. In return for French aid against Austria, Cavour agreed to cede Savoy and Nice to France. In giving himself away to Cavour the Emperor had anticipated a similar action of his a few years later, when he gave himself away to Bismarck at Biarritz. The political condition of Europe in 1859 undoubtedly favoured his policy. Russia was friendly to France, Prussia was unlikely to aid Austria, and not only was England fully occupied in dealing with the Indian Mutiny, but English public opinion favoured Italian unity.

On April 26, 1859, Austria declared war upon Italy, and was defeated by French and Italian armies in May and June in the battles of Montebello (May 20), Magenta (June 4), and Solferino (June 24). On July 6, without consulting Victor Emmanuel or Cavour, Napoleon made proposals to Francis Joseph for an armistice, which was concluded on July 8. On July 11 the war was closed by the Armistice of Villafranca, which on November 10, at Zurich, was converted into a formal treaty. Napoleon was then at the height of his power. He had, as it seemed, accomplished the objects for which France had fought. Piedmont was to extend from the Alps to the Adriatic, though Venice was to remain Austrian. Italy was to be free but not united, Savoy and Nice were to be ceded to France. For a time Napoleon

was regarded as the most powerful ruler in Europe, and the formation of the great Volunteer Force in England illustrates the alarm felt in that country at the rapid successes of the French armies. As it turned out, however, the war in Italy was, as M. de Gorce says, 'funeste, mais pour la France seulement', and in Italy the fate of the Second Empire was sealed. One reason for the sudden conclusion of the Armistice of Villafranca can be found in the hostile attitude of Prussia to France; but by desisting from the war, and by taking Savoy and Nice in March 1860, Napoleon alienated the Italians and excited feelings of distrust and resentment in England. Moreover, before two years had elapsed after the Treaty of Turin he realized that all his plans with regard to Italy were shattered. Central Italy united itself with Piedmont, the Papal territory was occupied by a Piedmontese army, General Cialdini defeated Lamoricière and his Papal forces at Castelfidardo, Garibaldi conquered the Two Sicilies. Napoleon had hoped to prevent the union of Italy and to protect the Pope. But Italy had become united under Victor Emmanuel II—the first Italian Parliament met in March 1861—and the Pope had lost his richest possessions.

In France, where Napoleon's policy towards Italy and the Papacy found many severe critics, his difficulties rapidly increased. He had declared himself in favour of a policy of nationality and free trade, and in 1860 made a Treaty of Commerce with England, only to find that it aroused deep opposition throughout France. Catholic France was infuriated at his publication of a pamphlet in December 1859, advising the Pope to renounce his claims to the Legations (all his possessions except Rome). The Liberal party, headed by Ollivier, pointed out the inconsistency of encouraging liberal institutions in Italy while denying them to France; and

Napoleon on November 24, 1860, by the advice of his half-brother, de Morny, issued a decree in the direction of constitutional government. The Address to the Throne was restored, official reports of the proceedings in the Senate and the Legislative Assembly were to be published, and ministers without portfolios were to represent the Emperor in the Chambers. A year later he agreed not to open 'supplementary credits when the Legislature was not sitting'.

The year 1863 was a momentous one for France both at home and abroad. In Europe a series of events of deep import took place, while in France the elections left the Emperor and the democracy face to face, at a time when, mainly owing to the American Civil War, France was passing through a commercial crisis. A large number of Liberals were returned to the Assembly, and, yielding to the appointment of Rouher as Minister of State in October 18, in place of de Persigny, who held that 'ministers should be responsible to the Emperor alone', he recognized the strength of the demand that ministers, as in England, should be responsible to Parliament. Unfortunately, he did not carry out what seemed to be his intentions. In the Mexican War he raised money without the consent of the Legislature, and he often ignored, or did not ask for, the advice of his ministers. 'Rêveur et conspirateur', says M. de Gorce, 'il le fut sur le trône et toujours.'¹

The year 1863 was also of immense European importance, and marks a definite step in Napoleon's downfall. In January of that year the outbreak of the Polish insurrection took place, while Napoleon was deeply involved in war with Mexico; in November Frederick VII of Denmark died, leaving his country on the verge of war over the Schleswig-Holstein question. Few men at that time realized the rapid growth

¹ See *Quarterly Review*, July 1902, pp. 9-14.

of the Prussian State, which was to be so soon consolidated by Sadowa and Sedan. Had he done so, Napoleon would not have endangered his friendship with Russia. As it was, his attitude towards the Polish rising lost him the support of the Tsar just when he needed it most.

Owing to his friendly relations with Russia he had felt secure in undertaking the Italian War of 1859, and in ignoring the opposition of England to his annexation of Savoy and Nice. He was so fully alive to the importance of a good understanding with Russia that it is difficult to explain his attitude during the Polish insurrection. Poland was inaccessible to France, as it was to England, and Napoleon's true policy was to refrain from any action. Unfortunately, he invited England to remonstrate with Prussia for agreeing to a military convention with Russia: Lord Russell refused his assent, but proposed that all the Powers should remonstrate with the Tsar. On receiving remonstrances from all the Great Powers except Prussia, the Tsar's ministers declined to continue the discussion, with the result that Paris clamoured for war, and Napoleon's position as Emperor was distinctly weakened. At the French elections held on May 31 and June 1, seventeen Republicans and eighteen Liberals were returned, among them being Thiers, Émile Ollivier, Jules Favre, and Jules Simon.

A complete and accurate history of the foreign policy of France between 1863 and 1870 has yet to be written. On March 30, 1863, Frederick VII incorporated Schleswig with Denmark. His action at once reopened the Danish question, which had, it was thought, been closed by the treaty of May 8, 1852. An anxious time ensued. The Emperor Napoleon, in the last week of October, endeavoured, in vain, to hold a Congress at Paris, to 'readjust the frontiers of

States and lay the foundations of a general pacification'. In November and December matters of the greatest import to Europe occurred in rapid succession. On November 14 Frederick VII died, and was succeeded by Christian IV, who refused to withdraw the Constitution of March 30, though, in spite of Palmerston's denunciation of the claims of the Germanic Confederation, he could not hope for any material assistance from Russia, England, or France. Napoleon, indeed, did not regard the Danish question as one of primary importance. His policy with regard to Poland had failed, he was involved in the Mexican 'affair', his influence in Italy had steadily declined. As Christian refused to withdraw the Constitution before January 1, 1864, the German Federation, acting nominally on behalf of the heir to the dukedom of Augustenburg, asserted its rights, and war followed, a force of Austrians and Prussians occupying Schleswig and Holstein in February. Christian was soon defeated, and lost Schleswig. 'The great blunder of the nineteenth century', writes M. Joseph Reinach, 'was the spoliation of the Danish duchies, which neither France, nor England, nor Russia, knew how to prevent.'¹ There is no doubt that these Powers showed, in spite of warnings, a most extraordinary lack of foresight and weakness. Had they acted together they could have prevented the spoliation of the Danish duchies—a crime and a

¹ *Quarterly Review*, April 1917, p. 399. In his *Memoirs* the late Lord Redesdale describes how one day early in February 1864 (he being Second Secretary of Embassy), Lord Napier, our Ambassador at St. Petersburg, received a dispatch from England instructing him to notify to Prince Gortschakoff that England would not interfere in Denmark. On reading the telegram the Prince said, 'Alors, milord, je mets de côté la supposition que l'Angleterre fasse jamais la guerre pour une question d'honneur' (vol. i, pp. 243-5).

blunder. They have paid dearly for their inaction and failure to check Prussia in 'her career of plunder'—France being despoiled in 1871,¹ and England being hampered and menaced in the present century by the opening of the Kiel Canal.

It is evident to-day that, to add to a well-known quotation, 'if the fate of the Second Empire was sealed in Italy, its grave was dug in Mexico'. Taking advantage of the continuance of the Civil War in America, Napoleon had embarked upon ambitious projects in Mexico: in June 1863 the capital was occupied, and in June 1864 the Archduke Maximilian landed at Vera Cruz to become ruler of the country. In 1865, however, the American Civil War ended, Juarez received reinforcements, and in 1867, the French troops having been withdrawn, Maximilian was captured by the Juarists and shot. This Imperial adventure has a certain interest. A powerful Latin monarchy was to curb the Teutonic Republic in the North. Thus the whole American continent would be prevented 'from falling under the political influence of Washington and the commercial control of New York'. But Napoleon's position in Europe required his full attention, and his tenure of the throne of France was too precarious for him to attempt ambitious schemes on the American continent. It is said that in 1866, owing to the Mexican War, France was not able to place a fully equipped army of 50,000 men on the Rhine. This fact was of incalculable importance, for war broke out between Austria and Prussia in June of that year, and on July 3 the Austrians suffered an overwhelming defeat in the battle of Königgrätz (Sadowa). In October 1865 Napoleon had had his well-known interview at Biarritz with Bismarck. Affairs in Mexico were going badly—in April 1865 the War of Secession had ended, and in February 1866 Napoleon had decided to withdraw all French

troops from the country,—Napoleon's Italian and Polish policy had left him without allies, but he continued to delude himself with the expectation that a long war between Prussia and Austria would take place, at the conclusion of which France, as arbiter, would claim a share of the spoils.

Prussia's success at Sadowa on July 3, 1866, came as a terrible shock to Napoleon's schemes. It ended all his hopes of acting as armed mediator between two exhausted belligerents. Italy indeed obtained Venice, and this was satisfactory to Napoleon, but Prussia was now supreme in North Germany, and the best French troops were still in Mexico. During the remainder of 1866 and the early months of 1867 Europe passed through an anxious period. Napoleon's demand for Mainz and territory on the left bank of the Rhine, followed by his offer to purchase Luxemburg, produced no results except that Luxemburg was declared neutral. In 1867 the Great Exhibition at Paris seemed to imply that the relations of all the European Powers were on a satisfactory footing. But the attack of the Pole Beresowski on the life of the Tsar Alexander II was followed at the end of June by the news that Maximilian had been shot in Mexico. Public opinion was deeply affected, the French Empire lost prestige, and it behoved Napoleon to walk warily. In the autumn close and friendly relations were established with Austria, but this advantage was to a great extent nullified by the fierce hostility of Garibaldi and all Italian patriots, whose attack on the States of the Church failed owing to their defeat at Mentana on November 3, 1867 by a French army under General de Failly. As long as Napoleon pursued the policy of defending Rome against the Italian patriots, he could hardly expect the support of Italy in a war with Germany. He had lost his influence

with Italy and could not guarantee Austria against an Italian attack.

Moreover, Napoleon's domestic difficulties were increasing daily. Hoping to conciliate the opposition of the Republican party in Parliament, and the growing hostility of the working classes, the Emperor in the spring of 1868 granted freedom of the press and the right of holding public meetings, under certain restrictions. During the whole of 1869, while Prussia was arming, the opposition in France gained in strength, and the elections of May showed that the opponents of the Empire had increased in a most striking fashion. Napoleon was by no means unaware of the danger to France from Germany: even in 1868 the French military *attaché* at Berlin had written that 'any accident may bring on war'.¹ Moreover, a few far-sighted Frenchmen, among whom was Napoleon himself, had after the war of 1866 advocated universal military service. But, as frequently happened, Napoleon showed weakness in view of the Republican opposition, and no military reforms of any value were carried out. For the disasters of 1870-1 the Republicans were in no small degree responsible.

In addition to entering upon negotiations with Austria in view of the impending struggle with Prussia, Napoleon did indeed, between 1866 and 1870, try to make secret agreements with Bavaria, Würtemberg, and Hesse-Darmstadt. The extent of these proposals to the German States is at present uncertain, but the world now knows that in the early weeks of 1870 much progress was made in as far as Austria was concerned. But no definite agreement could be come to with Austria, and the proposal, early in 1870, of Lord Clarendon for a general disarmament met with no support

¹ *Cambridge Modern History*, vol. xi, p. 486.

in Prussia, or from Napoleon's advisers. On July 2 the avowed candidature of a Hohenzollern prince for the throne of Spain gave the pretext which the war party in France was seeking. In the previous month of May, at the elections, Napoleon had secured a majority, and Ollivier, who had in January formed a ministry, had on June 30 declared that 'at no moment was the maintenance of peace in Europe better assured'. On July 12, owing to the remonstrance of the French ministry, which now included the Duc de Gramont as Minister of Foreign Affairs, the Hohenzollern candidature was withdrawn. On July 13 the French envoy, Benedetti, obtained from the King of Prussia a declaration of his approval of the withdrawal of the Hohenzollern candidate. But Bismarck published a telegraphic account of this meeting at Ems so altered as to imply an insult to Benedetti. The news caused great agitation in Paris, and late on July 14 the Council of Ministers voted for war.

France thus entered into war with her powerful neighbour while she herself was isolated and from a military point of view unprepared. Russia was unwilling to move on behalf of France, and already was contemplating a fresh advance in Asia. The disclosure of the French Emperor's designs on Belgium and Luxemburg alienated England; Austria required time to make military preparations; Italy was bent on the possession of Rome. France, then, entered the war with no allies, and too late realized her inability to mobilize rapidly. Moreover, the war was never popular in the Departments, nor among the more thoughtful of the Parisian deputies. It was brought about by Napoleon's *entourage*, who held the view that 'war was a logical necessity of the Imperial régime'; and they were supported by the Parisian populace, who did not regard the grant of parliamentary institutions as an

equivalent for the loss of glory in Mexico and elsewhere. They were, too, absolutely ignorant of the real condition of the army. In a few months France sustained a series of overwhelming defeats.

Though Napoleon had not sufficient determination to insist on improvements in the weapons and general strength of the army, reforms which he knew were absolutely indispensable, the blame for the overthrow of France in 1870-1 must be shared by the French people, and especially by the Parisian populace. When Thiers opposed the madness of the war, on the ground that it was being made 'without necessity, without preparations, and without alliances', he was hooted in the Chamber, while the mob had 'demonstrated' before his house. On August 10 a new ministry was formed, and on August 13 a Committee of National Defence was created. Meanwhile Bismarck's publication of the designs which during the last few years Napoleon had entertained against Belgium had alarmed the English cabinet, which early in August obtained from both Prussia and France assurances of their recognition of the neutrality of Belgium. The French declaration of war was received in Berlin on July 19, but the forces of both France and of the North German Confederation were ordered to mobilize four days earlier. The *affaire* of Saarbrücken, on August 2, opened the war, and before August 20 a number of battles had been fought, and it was evident that victory lay with the Germans. On September 1 the stupendous disaster of Sedan took place, and on the next day the Emperor with some 80,000 officers and men surrendered as prisoners of war. Important events followed.

The situation in France in September 1870 was not very unlike the situation in 1814. 'The Second Empire, like the First, went down before a foreign foe: Leipzig was echoed

by Sedan.’¹ In 1814, however, the restoration of the ancient monarchy was accomplished : in 1870 France returned to the republican form of government set up in 1848. The crisis which had been ‘smothered in 1851 revived more ominous than before in 1870’. On September 3, 1870, the news of Sedan reached Paris. On September 4 a Government of National Defence was formed. But the Paris mob broke in upon the Assembly, and brought the meeting to an end. Gambetta then proclaimed the Third Republic at the Hôtel de Ville, and General Trochu organized the defence of Paris under the Government of National Defence. On October 27 Bazaine capitulated at Metz; on December 4 Orleans was captured, in spite of the efforts of General Chanzy, and from that time the organization of the Army of the Loire was broken up. Meanwhile, the Government of National Defence, driven from Tours, had assembled at Bordeaux, where it remained till the capitulation of Paris and the signing of the preliminaries of peace.

General Bourbaki’s failure in the East finally determined the fate of France. Bourbaki, who was born in 1816, had distinguished himself in the Crimean War, and in 1870 his military reputation was high. After the severe French defeats on the Loire in the last week of November and the first week of December General Chanzy, with the 16th and 17th Corps, fell back slowly to Le Mans, while the 15th (the centre) and the 18th and 20th Corps (the right) retreated to Bourges. D’Aurelle de Paladines, who had commanded these troops—the First Army of the Loire—was superseded by Bourbaki, who was to make an attempt to strike a blow at the German communications. But he was constantly interfered

¹ Lowes Dickinson, *Revolution and Reaction in Modern France*, p. 249
London : George Allen, 1892).

with by Freycinet, who was practically the Civil Secretary for War, so that the campaign, initiated by the minister, was in no sense one for which Bourbaki was solely responsible. The latter, when a strong man as commander was absolutely necessary, showed culpable weakness in allowing himself to be guided by Freycinet and Serres (a young civil engineer). The result of carrying on a campaign directed by a Triumvirate—Bourbaki, Freycinet, and Serres—was that ‘in the battle of the Lisaine, January 15-17, the fate of France was sealed’.

On January 28, 1871, an armistice was agreed upon to enable the elections to be held in order that the opinion of the country should be taken on the question of peace. During the elections Gambetta favoured the continuance of war. The capitulation of Paris, in his view, would not prevent the war from being carried on by the Departments, whose resources would rapidly increase. Many Germans, he argued, feared lest a continuance of the war would lead to European intervention—a possibility to which Bismarck was fully alive—England and Italy were certainly against the dismemberment of France. The Assembly, which after the elections met at Bordeaux, decided in favour of peace; Gambetta retired to Spain, and Thiers, ‘who was inevitable’, was now supreme. Although there was some plausibility in Gambetta’s arguments, it must be remembered that France, unlike Spain, Russia, and Italy, is not a country in which it is easy to conduct a protracted guerrilla warfare.

During the negotiations which terminated in the Treaty of Frankfort, Bismarck, as after the battle of Königgrätz (Sadowa) in 1866, was in favour of moderation. He was opposed to the retention of Metz with its large French population, and also to the acquisition of Belfort. On these

points he was opposed by the King, now German Emperor, and by von Moltke. Eventually it was decided to keep Metz with Alsace and Lorraine. Thiers's efforts to preserve for France the important town and fortress of Belfort were, however, successful. In possession of Belfort the Germans could easily pour troops down the valley of the Doubs and dominate Burgundy and the Lyonnais. Belfort, unlike Metz, had not been captured by the German forces, and it was a point of honour to all Frenchmen that it should not be handed over to Germany. The Germans, however, insisted that if they yielded with regard to Belfort a portion of their army should enter Paris.

On May 10 the Treaty of Frankfort confirmed the preliminaries, which included the payment of five milliards to Germany. The Assembly at Bordeaux discussed the treaty of peace drawn up by Thiers, who, by the way, had attempted to obtain Luxemburg as a compensation for the loss of Metz. It was recognized that it was necessary to submit to the loss of Alsace and Lorraine. At the first meeting of the Assembly on February 17 the deputies from the Departments of Haut-Rhin, Bas-Rhin, and the Moselle declared the 'ever inviolable right of the Alsatians and Lorrainers to remain members of the French nation'. On March 1 the Assembly voted the preliminaries of peace, and the deputies from Alsace-Lorraine made their famous and final protest against the ratification of a treaty which handed them over to the German Empire. This protest was renewed in the Reichstag in 1874, and again in 1887, Alsace-Lorraine having been constituted a mere province of the German Empire and not placed on an equal footing with the other German States.

Before, however, peace was signed a revolution broke out in Paris on March 18, and the Commune, which elected its

Government on March 26, became all-powerful. During the armistice some 60,000 of the better classes left Paris, while the Assembly, which established itself at Versailles on March 20, took no steps to preserve order in the capital, which was practically in the hands of a population armed and idle, and exasperated at the march of the German troops through part of the city. The Assembly was itself unpopular, not only owing to its decision to sit at Versailles, but also from the presence within it of a large monarchical element, while Paris, which had deserved well of France, desired a republic. Moreover, it showed a want of firmness at the outset of the rising in Paris. The revolution lasted till the end of May, when, after eight days of street fighting, the troops of the Assembly suppressed the movement.

■

The Third Republic, 1871-1918

A. 1871-8

THE FORMATION OF A CONSTITUTION

No sooner was peace made than two great problems demanded solution. Firstly, the establishment of authority in France, and the choice of a form of government; and secondly, the execution of the terms of peace, involving the payment of an enormous indemnity before the liberation of the territory could be effected.

The rapid recovery of France, which naturally surprised if not alarmed Bismarck and the war party in Germany, was due, in no small measure, to the efforts of Thiers. He had shown great skill in his management of the peace negotiations, and though France was compelled, in addition to her loss of Alsace and most of Lorraine, to cede Metz, she kept Belfort, much to the irritation of the Prussian war party. The manner, too, in which he dealt with the later phases of the Commune was admirable. When the Commune had been suppressed, it remained for the Assembly to execute the terms of peace and to settle what form of government should be set up. The Assembly had a large royalist majority, though France was, in the main, republican, and possible candidates for the vacant throne were the Comte de Chambord and the Comte de Paris. Thiers himself was, for a time, an advocate of constitutional monarchy, but favoured a waiting policy. Before he fell, on May 24, 1873, he had convinced himself that a republic was a necessity for France—'La République sera

conservatrice ou elle ne sera pas' were Thiers's prophetic words. It was evident to him that a parliamentary republic was the form of government desired by the majority of the electors, who had been influenced by the magnificent oratorical campaigns of Gambetta.

On February 17 Thiers had been nominated 'Chief of the Executive Power of the French Republic', and after the Frankfort Treaty had been made continued till his fall to exercise the powers of a Dictator. During this period when he practically ruled France the country, 'owing to the native thrift of the peasant population', showed an astonishing power of recuperation. On November 13, 1872, he declared that 'the Republic exists; to desire anything else would be a new revolution and the most formidable of all. The Republic must be the Government of this nation.' Supported by his country he carried out a valuable programme. He reformed the system of secondary education, the jury system, and the *Conseil d'État*. He reorganized the army, he arranged for the payment of the war indemnity, he inaugurated a new protective tariff. Under his leadership France, it has been said, learned for the first time in her history 'to discuss without making a revolution'.

The year 1873 proved to be one of no little interest, and indeed of importance to France. It opened with the death of the Emperor Napoleon at Chislehurst, it found Thiers the object of dislike to the monarchist majority in the Assembly, and Gambetta popular among the French constituencies. Hence a dissolution could not be advocated at that time by the reactionaries. But they were able shortly to effect the fall of Thiers, who, though now an avowed supporter of a republican form of government, was not popular with the extreme Left. On May 24, 1873, Thiers defended his policy

in the Chamber. He declared that a conservative republic was the only form of government suitable to France at that time, when the majority in the Assembly, which did not represent the majority in the country, could not decide between the pretenders for the French throne. A majority of 14 then carried what Thiers regarded as a vote of censure, and he resigned.

Marshal MacMahon, Duke of Magenta, 'le glorieux vaincu' of Sedan, was chosen to succeed Thiers as President of the Republic, and during the years in which he held office France passed through an anxious period. Fear of a fresh attack upon her by Germany, and the uncertainty with regard to the form of government which would be finally established, made the years between 1873 and 1878 a period of unusual anxiety. MacMahon was regarded as a Legitimist; but that cause was ruined in October 1873 when the Comte de Chambord refused to give up the White Flag of the Bourbons. During the ensuing four years MacMahon was engaged in a ceaseless struggle with the Republican party, which gained fresh strength at each general election. Apart from domestic matters the years 1874 and 1875 were marked by a recrudescence of German hostility.

For some four years it had seemed that France, suffering from the effects of the war of 1870, would be a *quantité négligeable* in European politics. Allied with both Austria and Russia, Bismarck had grounds for his belief that France was powerless for offence. He rightly argued that he was unlikely to obtain support from England, at any rate for some time to come, especially as the Liberal Government in England was fully occupied with home affairs, and Anglo-Russian rivalry in Asia forbade the possibility of any lasting friendship between the Courts of Petersburg and St. James's.

The Treaty of Frankfort (May 10, 1871) marked the close of the predominance which France had held in Europe since the Crimean War. Till the present day the new-born German Empire has remained the predominant state in Western Europe. In spite, however, of the overwhelming defeat of her armies, of the loss of Alsace and Lorraine, and of her isolation in Europe, France showed such extraordinary recuperative powers that in 1875, in spite of his denial, Bismarck contemplated hostilities against the French nation. France had already paid the enormous war indemnity exacted by Germany; and by the law of March 1875 she could put into the field an army of 2,400,000 men.

In the early months of 1874 a rumour, indeed, spread through France that, in spite of the pacific declarations of Decazes, the French Foreign Minister, the unprincipled war party in Germany might succeed in making a fresh attack on France. The alarm, however, died out in the summer, and the French political parties continued their ceaseless struggles until they were suddenly interrupted by the famous war scare of 1875. In March of that year Decazes became aware that the German Government was threatening Belgium, and had stopped the export of horses. There seems little doubt that Bismarck was endeavouring to persuade the Emperor and the Crown Prince that the French were meditating an invasion of Germany through Belgium, and in April appeared, in the *Berlin Post*, the famous article, 'Is war in sight?' It was asserted by the German military authorities that the steady increase of the French armaments must be checked, and there was a consensus of opinion in Belgium that Bismarck intended to occupy that country (as his successors did in 1914) on the pretence that France meditated a similar course. By the

influence, however, of the Tsar Alexander and Queen Victoria, the danger of a European war was averted. Alexander and Gortschakoff arrived in Berlin on May 10, following Count Schouvaloff (the Russian Ambassador in London), who on May 6 reassured Lord Odo Russell of the pacific intentions of the Tsar. The arrival of the Tsar in Berlin decided the question of peace or war, and Bismarck, defeated on every point, declared that the war rumours were due to the press and stock-jobbers. He was, in reality, furious at the failure of his plans, while the French were equally profuse in their thanks to the English Government. The most satisfactory result was that Bismarck's plan for establishing close confidential relations with Russia had received a serious blow, and it moreover seemed that the Tsar wished to be on friendly terms with both England and France.

Before the year closed two events took place which roused much attention, not only in France but throughout Europe. The purchase of a portion of the Suez Canal shares by Great Britain at the price of £4,000,000, though not approved of in Paris, was a small matter compared with the reopening of the Eastern question, caused by an insurrection in Herzegovina and Bosnia against the Turkish Government. Early in January 1876 the 'Andrassy Note' emphasized the seriousness of the crisis, and in the autumn a conference of the chief European Powers was held in Constantinople. The Conference, which broke up in January 1877, failed to settle the Eastern question, and war between Russia and Turkey became inevitable. That conflict ended in the spring of 1878 in the total defeat of Turkey. At one time it seemed that Great Britain and Russia would be at war, but eventually peace was restored to Europe by the Treaty of Berlin (July 1878). With the conclusion of peace the chief European

nations turned their attention to the acquisition of colonies.

During these eventful years France was chiefly occupied with internal politics which had little interest for other countries. Thiers had been his own Prime Minister, but MacMahon found it necessary to take a responsible leader of the Government from the Assembly. He therefore first appointed the Duc de Broglie, and was himself declared by the Assembly irremovable for seven years from November 20, 1873, to November 2, 1880. The establishment of the Septennate with a perpetual President, who had the power to appoint and dismiss ministries, soon made it apparent that the French nation had not yet grasped the principles of parliamentary government, or else despised them.

In May 1874 General de Cissey succeeded the Duc de Broglie, and formed a *cabinet d'affaires* to carry on the government of the country during a year which has been described as one of 'political deadlock and uncertainty'. The Orleanists expected that the death of the reactionary Comte de Chambord (grandson of Charles X) would clear the way for a monarchy under the Comte de Paris, while the Imperialists—the Prince Imperial being now 18 years old—having gained seats at various elections, were full of hope. The Duc de Bisaccia, the French ambassador in England, was actually surprised at being forced to resign because he had moved in the Chamber a resolution that the Government was a monarchy under Henry V, i.e. the Comte de Chambord, who had at least seventy supporters in the Chamber. The political situation in 1874 was indeed difficult to gauge. Hence the discussion of the organic laws in the first days of 1875—a discussion which produced a most durable constitution—proved to be of the most vital importance. In

January 1875 the Assembly, by a majority of one, accepted a Republican Constitution, and in February statutes were passed, 'defining the legislative and executive powers in the Republic and organizing the Senate'. These, joined to a third enactment voted in July, form the body of laws known as the 'Constitution of 1875', which has, with some revision, continued till the present day.

The Prime Minister, General de Cisse, now retired; but he became Minister of War under his successor, M. Buffet. During the year the method of selecting the members of the Senate and the Chamber of Deputies was discussed, and the opening of the year 1876 saw France embarked upon its new system of parliamentary government. M. Grévy was chosen President of the Chamber, and Carnot and Casimir-Périer appeared for the first time as deputies. M. Dufaure succeeded M. Buffet, and formed a cabinet which lasted till December, when, as the result of a severe ministerial crisis, Marshal MacMahon was compelled to accept Jules Simon as Prime Minister. But the following year, 1877, being dissatisfied with Simon's sympathies with the extreme Left, the Marshal carried out, on May 16, a *coup d'état* known as the 'Seize Mai'—a conspiracy with which the Church identified itself, and replaced the Prime Minister by the Duc de Broglie. The Ultramontane party had thus won a victory, which, however, was of little value, for as it was well said, 'between the Church and the Revolution there exists absolute incompatibility'. The country was firmly resolved to secure 'liberty of thought, tolerance, and education'.

Decazes remained in the Foreign Office till the following October, when, as the result of a general election, the Marshal and his ministers sustained a crushing defeat. It was a

thorough republican victory, and the Bonapartists were completely routed. After a short period of hesitancy the Marshal was compelled, in December, to yield to his enemies, and a moderate republican ministry was formed, which included Dufaure as President of the Council, Waddington as Minister of Foreign Affairs, Léon Say Minister of Finance, and Freycinet. In 1878 France illustrated her recuperative powers in the first international exhibition held at Paris after the war, and in January 1879 MacMahon resigned.

B. 1879-1904

COLONIAL DEVELOPMENT—STRAINED RELATIONS WITH GREAT
BRITAIN—THE FRANCO-RUSSIAN ALLIANCE

In January 1879 M. Jules Grévy, the President of the Chamber, was elected to succeed MacMahon as the President of the Republic by the Senate and Chamber united in congress. M. Waddington formed a ministry, and Gambetta, the chief founder of the Republic, was elected President of the Chamber.

In this ministry Jules Ferry was Minister of Education, and he lost no time in bringing forward educational proposals which were distinctly anti-clerical, and aimed chiefly at the Jesuits. This movement continued in various degrees during the ensuing years; and from 1901 there was a remarkable development of anti-clericalism, which ended in 1905 in the enactment of a law separating the Church from the State. After the brief ministries of Freycinet and Ferry, Gambetta formed his *Grand Ministère* on November 14, 1881. Like his predecessor, he favoured the joint intervention of France and England in Egypt, where Arabi Pasha, encouraged by the Sultan, was endeavouring to emancipate

Egypt from the financial control of Europe. Unfortunately, Gambetta fell on January 26, 1882, and was succeeded by Freycinet, who, after sending a French squadron to Alexandria in June, withdrew it on July 10, and left the English Fleet to bombard the city. In spite of a great speech by Gambetta in favour of co-operation with England, Freycinet refused to take an active part in Egypt.

The purchase of the Suez Canal shares by Lord Beaconsfield's Government in 1875, and the Anglo-Turkish Convention of 1878, roused great irritation in France, which was far from being allayed in 1882, when the French realized that by their refusal to co-operate with England in the suppression of Arabi's rising they had seriously weakened their position in Egypt. Early in January 1883 Gambetta and General Chanzy died, their deaths causing much consternation, especially that of Chanzy, whose influence over the army was considerable.

But if France had failed to take advantage of her opportunities in Egypt, she showed an increasing interest in her relations with the Far East, where Jules Ferry aimed at setting up a powerful French protectorate. From 1880 to 1885 his influence was in the ascendant. The conquest of Saigon in 1858 began the conquest of Annam. Difficulties with China followed, and were only temporarily adjusted by a treaty of 1874, whereby the French possession of Cochin-China, which dated from 1863, was recognized. In 1882 hostilities broke out with China, and in 1883 Jules Ferry sent out an expedition which conquered Tongking, in spite of fierce Chinese opposition. In June 1885 China made peace, abandoning her pretensions to suzerainty over Tongking and Annam, while in the same year the submission of Annam was effected. During the Chinese War a French force was put to flight near Langson. Incorrect news of this 'disaster'

reached Paris early in 1885, with the result that Ferry, who had made France the second colonial Power in the world, was compelled to retire from office. His fall was a serious disaster to French colonial aspirations. He had evolved a statesman-like project for the establishment of a new French Empire in the East. France possessed Cochin-China, Tongking, Cambodia, and Annam, and Ferry had counted upon the extension of French influence and the establishment of a French protectorate over the kingdom of Siam and that of Upper Burma. With the fall of Ferry many of his schemes collapsed, and in 1885-6 Lord Dufferin, the Viceroy of India, conquered Upper Burma. The ministry of Ferry also saw the outbreak of the fresh war in Madagascar in 1882, which ended in 1885. It was not till 1895 that the second war broke out, the result of which was the annexation of the island in 1896.

From about 1881 a renewal of hostilities between France and Germany seemed unlikely to take place, and French statesmen, as Gambetta had done, aimed at colonial expansion and a recovery of national prestige by military enterprises outside Europe. One notable Frenchwoman had endeavoured to induce Gambetta to keep *la revanche* in the forefront of his programme, but about 1880 she realized that those who advocated such a policy were a constantly dwindling majority.

The loss of influence in Egypt continued to cause deep discontent, and it was obvious that the French Government would 'work against English influence in Egypt by every means in its power, and unfortunately it was evident that in this anti-English policy it could reckon on the support of public opinion'.¹ At the end of June 1884 an Egyptian conference, which had been summoned by Lord Granville, was held in London; and though it sat till August it was

¹ *Lord Lyons*, by Lord Newton, p. 481 (T. Nelson & Sons).

rendered abortive by the support which Germany, Austria, and Russia gave to France against Great Britain, and produced no alleviation in the hostility of France to England. The opening of the year 1885 saw the failure of the British Expedition to Khartoum, and the possibility of an outbreak of war between England and Russia over Central Asian questions. Lord Lyons wrote a most interesting letter to Lord Granville at this crisis. He pointed out that the French realized Bismarck's design to embroil England and Russia, to separate England and France, and to set up an alliance between France and Germany. It was believed by some that Bismarck hoped to reconcile the French to the loss of Alsace and Lorraine by handing over to them Belgium, or a part of Belgium, while Germany annexed Holland.¹

The early months of 1885 formed indeed a critical period in the history of Europe. In March Ferry, who had been in office two years and one month, fell, owing to a strong feeling against his spirited colonial policy; towards the end of April the British Government asked for a credit of eleven millions in view of the uncertain attitude of Russia. The 'Penjdeh incident', the news of which reached England early in April, had caused a financial panic, and war with Russia seemed by no means an unlikely event. Bismarck's hopes of a rupture between the English and Russian nations were thus far from being groundless. In a letter to Lord Granville, written early in May, Lord Lyons declared that the symptoms apparent in Paris indicated that Bismarck was also busily employed in getting up a European coalition against England on the Egyptian question, and that he had attempted 'to seduce or terrify the French Government'.

The French, however, had not entirely given up their

¹ *Lord Lyons*, p. 504.

determination to recover Alsace and Lorraine on the first opportunity. They were well aware that Bismarck was their real enemy, and accordingly the possibility of a rupture between England and Russia was viewed in Paris with great apprehension.

About the same time (March 1885) the basis of an arrangement between France and England, with regard to the Egyptian debt, was settled to the great satisfaction of Lord Lyons, though France was still in the midst of acrimonious quarrels with England on the subject of China and Tongking. The situation, 'the most serious that the British race had faced since the years 1810-11',¹ however, gradually improved, and the danger of a European war passed away, though the jealousy which marked the French attitude towards England was in no way lessened. In February 1887 Lord Salisbury wrote thus to Lord Lyons: 'The French are inexplicable. One would have thought that under existing circumstances it was unnecessary to make enemies—that there were enough provided for France by nature just now.'²

Nevertheless, at the very time when Lord Salisbury was writing these words, England guaranteed Italy against an attack from France. Lord Salisbury was resolved to 'assure the *status quo* in the Mediterranean', while the possibility of a Franco-Russian alliance was the subject of discussion in France. Russia, Germany, and Austria had made an alliance at Skierniewice in the autumn of 1884 to last for three years; and, partly owing to the Schnaebele incident³ in April

¹ *Quarterly Review*, July 1910, p. 117.

² *Lord Lyons*, p. 532.

³ Schnaebele, a French Police Commissioner, was arrested by German agents in Alsace. Russia protested, and the German Emperor released him without consulting Bismarck, who is thought to have hoped that the incident would lead to war with France.

1887, it was not renewed. It is said that both France and Russia had attempted in the previous autumn to detach Italy from her alliance with Germany and Austria, but the Italian Premier, Signor Depretis, declined these overtures, and the alliance of Germany, Austria, and Italy was renewed in 1887. France at this time (1887-8) was passing through the Boulanger crisis, which was anxiously watched by Europe, Boulanger's object being, in view of the New Army Bill in Germany, to strengthen the French army, and to bring about a close alliance with Russia. Before the close of 1888, Boulanger was removed from the army for insubordination; but in January 1889 he was elected a member of the Assembly. The Tirard-Constans Ministry indicted him for treason, and on April 1 he fled to Brussels. The danger to the Republic—for at one time Boulanger's popularity did seem to be a danger—was now averted.

Meanwhile, the interest of France in colonial expansion, especially in Africa, had steadily deepened. After the close of the Congress of Berlin the alliance of Germany and Austria was strengthened, in 1883, by the adhesion of Italy. This event was a consequence of the seizure of Tunis by France in 1881. Protests were made by the Italian and Turkish Governments; but as both England and Germany had assured France that they were agreeable to the French occupation of Tunis their protests were unavailing. From the moment of the proclamation of the French regency over Tunisia, the two Latin sisters were estranged. Italy allied herself with Germany and Austria, and in 1888 the two Powers were on the brink of rupture. Though it was averted, a tariff-war between Italy and France followed and continued for eleven years. This suspension of friendly relations between these two countries was one of the earliest

difficulties arising from the partition of Africa. In 1885 Germany annexed the continental possessions of the Sultan of Zanzibar; and in 1889 and 1890 agreements were entered into by the French and English Governments regulating their relations on the Gambia and at Sierra Leone, at the same time defining their spheres of influence in Central Africa. In 1890 the French protectorate over Madagascar received formal recognition.

The dismissal of Bismarck by the Emperor William II, in March 1890, startled Europe, for it was obvious that the peace of Europe depended upon the sole will of an autocrat whose character at that time was a closed book to European statesmen. Four months later (July) England and Germany made an agreement, the former yielding Heligoland and receiving full possession of the island of Zanzibar.

This agreement was followed in 1891 by the renewal of the Triple Alliance, by a visit in July of the Emperor William to England, and by a visit, in the same month, of the French Channel Fleet to Kronstadt.

The continued hostility of France towards England is difficult to explain, except on the supposition that successive French Governments could not forget or forgive England's occupation of Egypt. Perhaps, too, Frenchmen still resented Great Britain's success in India and Canada, at the expense of France, in the eighteenth century. Owing to this attitude of France Lord Salisbury was forced to regard the Triple Alliance as 'the best guarantee for European peace'; but the fact that he invited the French Fleet, on its triumphal return from Kronstadt, to visit Portsmouth, where it was reviewed by Queen Victoria, showed that he had no feeling of hostility to France.

The years 1890-1 have been described as the calmest since

the war. Freycinet became Prime Minister in the spring of 1890, and the Republic, which had been weakened during the 'Boulangier Movement', seemed consolidated. No change of ministry took place in 1891; but the tranquillity of these years was followed in 1892 by discussions on the relations of France with the Church, and in the autumn by 'the bursting forth of the Panama scandal'. The insolvency of the company which had been formed for carrying through the Panama project involved several ministers and ex-ministers such as M. de Freycinet, and the net result was the weakening of the Government of the Republic. The elections of 1893 and 1894 were of little interest except as showing that the French population, even including that of Paris, had become utterly indifferent to internal politics. The following years, however, saw the country somewhat roused from its apathy, and fully alive to events at home and abroad.

The year 1895 marked the conclusion of the Franco-Russian alliance; it also witnessed the opening of the famous Dreyfus *affaire*, which was one of the chief topics of domestic interest in France from 1895 to 1899. In 1895 Captain Alfred Dreyfus was sentenced to imprisonment for life for having betrayed military secrets to the Triple Alliance. From 1896 to 1899 France was the scene of a violent controversy on the subject of the guilt or innocence of Dreyfus. The violent anti-Semitic feeling in France for a time checked all attempts to reopen the case, and gradually, among a comparatively small number of Frenchmen, an uneasy misgiving became apparent. At length, in February 1899, M. Loubet became President of the Senate after the death of Faure, and shortly after his appointment the united divisions of the *Cour de Cassation* ordered that a second trial should be held at Rennes. In August the trial took place, and

Dreyfus was again found guilty. The ministry, however, advised the President to pardon the prisoner; and to the satisfaction of all moderate Frenchmen the Dreyfus *affaire* was ended, though during the remainder of the year the passions excited over the trial led to something like anarchy in Paris.

Meanwhile the Waldeck-Rousseau ministry had, in June, succeeded that of Dupuy (which had opposed the proposal of a new trial of Dreyfus), and held office till June 1902, when the Prime Minister retired on account of bad health. The ministry had lasted about three years, and was of longer duration than that of any ministry since 1871. After some negotiations M. Combes became Prime Minister, and remained in office till January 1905. The opening of the twentieth century found the Republic firmly established with the Constitution of 1875 practically unaltered, and the majority of the nation bent on a campaign against the influence of the Roman Catholic Church, which was regarded as distinctly anti-republican. For some four years the campaign was carried on with ever-increasing violence till, in 1904, members of religious orders were interdicted from teaching, and in 1905 a bill for the separation of the Churches from the State was carried.

It is thought that only the scandals connected with the Panama Canal prevented the Tsar from making, at that time, the alliance with France which was in effect concluded by Nicholas II in 1895. During the life of Alexander III there was undoubtedly an *entente* between the two countries, and the Tsar had visited France in October 1893. He never cared for democratic institutions, and it was not till June 10, 1895 (he died in the previous November), that Nicholas II, his successor and son, acknowledged that an

alliance existed between France and Russia—and it is probable that the alliance only signified a defensive agreement to provide against the possibility of an attack on the part of the Triple Alliance in Europe. Meanwhile, the relations of France with Great Britain and Italy remained in a very strained condition.

Already in possession of Algiers and Tunis, France had now to be reckoned with in all questions concerning the Congo Free State, over which she had acquired the right of pre-emption. Henceforward, Frenchmen had before them the dream of a great African Empire. Their activities were not, however, confined to Africa, for already, as has been pointed out above, they had established a protectorate over the kingdom of Annam, thus securing the command of the coast-line from Saigon to Tongking. The possession of Tunis and of Cochin-China, which, like Cambodia, was a legacy of the Second Empire, led them to make great efforts to secure a number of colonists; for it was hoped that the existence of a French settlement in Tongking and Cochin-China would strengthen the commercial and political influence of France in that part of the East Indies.

In both Africa and Asia the enterprise of the French brought them into contact with the British, and on three occasions the outbreak of war seemed almost inevitable.

The Russian Alliance had thus led Frenchmen to recur to Ferry's policy of establishing an Empire in the Far East. His projects had received the full support of Germany; and in 1893-4 his successors hoped to carry out his plans by the aid of the Russian Government. They were all the more encouraged in their views as it was the general belief that Russia and England would, before many years were over, enter upon a tremendous conflict for the possession of India.

In the event of a Russian victory France could hope to gain valuable additions to her territory. It is therefore not surprising that in 1893 difficulties arose as to the extent of the spheres of influence possessed by France and Great Britain in Siam. The aim of Ferry to secure for France a protectorate over Siam has already been mentioned; but with his fall in 1885 all chance of realizing his hopes had disappeared. Nevertheless, in July 1895 the attitude of the French became so threatening that war with Great Britain seemed in December to be within sight. Luckily peace was preserved, and it was finally settled by an agreement on January 5, 1896, that Central Siam should be neutralized. Some months later the news of the advance of the French down the right bank of the Niger and of the occupation of Boussa (which was under the British protectorate) reached England; and as the French refused to abandon their claim to the country west of the Niger, matters reached a point so critical that in February 1897 hostilities seemed inevitable. Owing, however, to the conciliatory attitude of M. Hanotaux, and the diversion of public interest in France to the Far East, the outbreak of war with England was again averted, and in June 1898 a convention of general delimitation, settling the respective claims of England and France in Africa, was agreed to—France evacuating Boussa.

Meanwhile, events of far-reaching importance were being enacted in the Far East, where in 1894 war broke out between China and Japan. In April 1895 the war closed with the Treaty of Shimonoseki, by which Japan gained the island of Formosa, the Pescadores group, and the Liaotung peninsula. Russia, France, and Germany, however, insisted that Japan should not secure territory which included Port Arthur. Japan acceded, but in 1898 Russia herself occupied Port

Arthur, and France and England occupied respectively the ports of Kwang Chow Wan and Wei-Hai-Wei, Germany taking Kiaochou. France also obtained various concessions from China, who engaged herself not to cede to any Power the provinces of Yunnan and Canton, nor the island of Hainan (all in the French zone of influence), and put France into possession of the railways and mines of Yunnan. These and other concessions illustrate the importance of the year 1898 to France. During the same year France had joined England, Italy, and Russia in settling the Cretan question.

The activities of the French in Africa, however, never ceased, and a third crisis in their relations with Great Britain took place in the autumn of 1898, when Colonel Marchand (the agent, it is said, of a Franco-Russian conspiracy to seize the Upper Nile), who probably was unaware of the existence of the Convention of the previous June, occupied Fashoda, thus making a serious attempt to encroach upon the Nile Valley, though in 1895 Sir Edward Grey had declared that any such encroachment would be regarded as an unfriendly act. Fortunately, in M. Delcassé France had a statesman who realized that the real foe of his country was Germany; and early in 1899 agreements were arranged, with regard to the Nile Valley and the hinterland of Tripoli, which were satisfactory to both nations.

France had no reason to be dissatisfied with her colonial policy in Africa. The rapid extension of her power over the hinterland of North-West Africa, and the successful manner in which she hemmed in the German colony of the Cameroons (a success ratified by a convention with Germany in 1904), are alike admirable.

During the Boer War the attitude of the French nation was similar to that of the English press towards France during

the Dreyfus *affaire*, and was distinctly unfriendly, though in 1900, when the Boer War was at its height, French, English, German, Japanese, and Russian troops were acting together in occupying Peking and in suppressing the Boxer outbreak.

To sum up, it is evident that during the period from 1878 to 1904 the quarrels of France with England, Spain, and Italy often seemed serious. But the quarrels were always amicably settled by agreements and compromises. Neither England, Spain, nor Italy have shown any lasting resentment at France's colonial activities, and the result is that friendly relations now exist between all these Powers.

C. 1904-18

THE ANGLO-FRENCH ENTENTE—WAR WITH GERMANY

During the last twenty years of the nineteenth century the foreign policy of France thus passed through many phases. During that period three facts stand out. The first is that gradually among many Frenchmen there arose, towards the end of the century, a feeling that the question of the reconquest of Alsace and Lorraine should not be allowed to stand in the way of an amicable understanding with Germany. The second is that French and English colonial rivalry, from 1880 to 1903, brought the two countries to the verge of war on at least three occasions. The third is that from about 1903 it was recognized in France that the true interests of the country would be best served by an understanding with England. This became all the more essential owing to the Japanese successes, in 1905, over the Russian army and fleet, which for a time considerably lessened the value of the alliance with Russia.

After the close of the Boer War, during which the intention

of Germany to become a great naval as well as a great military Power had become manifest, agreements were made by France with Great Britain, and by the latter Power with Russia. The Anglo-French Entente of 1904 closed a period of friction between the two countries which had existed since the Treaty of Berlin in 1878; while in 1907 an Anglo-Russian agreement was come to, much to the satisfaction of the French nation. The Triple Entente was now constituted. By the agreement of April 1904 France definitely recognized Great Britain's predominant position in Egypt, and both Powers came to an agreement on questions relating to Siam, Nigeria, the New Hebrides, Madagascar, and Newfoundland.

This Anglo-French Entente was not made a moment too soon, for early in 1905 the battle of Mukden was fought, and it was evident that for some time to come Russia would be a *quantité négligeable* in European politics. The German Emperor at once took action, visited Tangier in April, declared that Germany was deeply interested in Morocco, and encouraged a violent anti-French journalist campaign. Delcassé, who, as the chief author of the Anglo-French Entente, was regarded with special hostility by the Emperor, found himself obliged to resign on June 6; and the French Government in September consented to a conference on the Moroccan question. The conference was held at Algeciras in January 1906, and was disappointing to Germany: the Anglo-French friendship remained unshaken, and even Italy, though a member of the Triple Alliance, supported France. France made it quite evident that, while she had no intention of conquering or of annexing economically Morocco, she had legitimate claims to a privileged position in that country. One most important result of the crisis of 1905 was, that it made it quite apparent to M. Rouvier's

ministry, firstly, that only the abandonment of British friendship would satisfy Germany, and secondly, that the conference had shown the loyalty of England to her ally, and the immense value of that loyalty.

Thus the policy of alliance with England—a policy always advocated by Gambetta—had been definitely accepted by France. It was a policy favoured also by Clémenceau, that powerful ‘cabinet maker’ who, in 1906, at the age of sixty-five, entered the Sarrien ministry—‘the ministry of all the talents’—as Minister of the Interior. On the resignation of M. Sarrien in October Clémenceau became Premier, his ministry including M. Caillaux, ‘an adventurous financier’, M. Pichon at the Foreign Office, General Picquart—the supporter of Dreyfus—at the War Office, and M. Viviani the first Minister of Labour. The Third Republic, up to the appointment of M. Clémenceau, had seen twenty-seven prime ministers, many of them men of great ability. But none of them had shown greater ability or foresight than had M. Clémenceau, who at a critical time in European history never wavered from the policy of friendship with England—a policy which he had steadily advocated for many years.

In 1881 Vacherot, after advocating the maintenance of the Balance of Power in Europe, had stated that such a balance could only be maintained by means of alliances. ‘France’, he said, ‘can find opportunities to ally herself now with England, now with Russia, now with Italy, and now again with those three Powers simultaneously, if a common and compelling interest urges such a coalition in the interest of European equilibrium, threatened by the predominance of Germany strengthened by Austrian support.’¹

As an illustration of the complete failure to understand the

¹ *Cambridge Modern History*, vol. xii, p. 99.

significance of the Franco-Russian alliance, it may be of some interest to notice that in the November number of the *Nineteenth Century*, 1897, the late Signor Crispi wrote a severe attack on the alliance of the Russian Empire with the French Republic, and, moreover, criticized the claim of France to Alsace and Lorraine, declaring that Alsace is German, Lorraine of uncertain nationality. He also made the somewhat surprising statement that 'the inhabitants of the Rhenish provinces, who by the fortunes of war in 1871 were placed again in the fatherland that was theirs of old, show no signs of a disposition to change'. He closed his article by comparing the Franco-Russian alliance of the last decade of the last century with the Treaty of Erfurt of 1808, and hinted that the question of Poland would shortly sever the friendship existing between Russia and France.

In 1911 the Anglo-French Entente was again threatened, when the German Government suddenly dispatched the *Panther* to Agadir, nominally as a reply to a French expedition which had been sent to Fez, in reality hoping to secure the excellent harbour of Agadir on the Atlantic coast of Morocco. The intention of the Germans to possess a naval station on the Atlantic was, however, frustrated by the determined attitude of the British Government. After negotiations with France, Germany obtained not a port on the Atlantic but a small inland piece of the French Congo.


In the present war France is resolved to recover Alsace and Lorraine, torn from her in 1871. On March 1, 1871, in the *Assemblée Nationale* which met at Bordeaux, the deputation from Alsace-Lorraine read the following protest: 'We declare once more to be null and void any treaty which disposes of us without our consent. . . . Your brothers of Alsace and Lorraine, separated at this moment from the common

family, will conserve for France, absent from their homes, a filial affection, until that day when they will come and once more take their place there.' On August 2, 1914, German troops entered French territory. The reply of the French nation will be the reconquest of Alsace and Lorraine.

TABLES


I

THE HOUSE OF CONDÉ




II

THE FRENCH BOURBONS



III


THE BOURBONS IN SPAIN AND THE SICILIES



IV

THE CHIEF BONAPARTES

Charles Bonaparte = Letitia Ramogliini.



V

THE REVOLUTIONARY CALENDAR

Vendémiaire	September.
Brumaire	October.
Frimaire	November.
Nivôse	December.
Pluviôse	January.
Ventôse	February.
Germinal	March.
Floréal	April.
Prairial	May.
Messidor	June.
Thermidor	July.
Fructidor	August.

INDEX

A

Aachen, 10.
 Abelard, 22.
 Abercrombie, General, 223.
 Acadia (Nova Scotia), 160, 166, 168.
 Acre, 25, 220.
 Acton, Lord (quoted), 189, 197, 208.
 Adela of Champagne, 24.
 Adrian VI, Pope, 103.
 Africa, North, 182.
 — West, 152.
 Agenais, the, 39.
 Agincourt, battle of, 63, 69.
 Agnadello, battle of, 95.
 Agnes of Meran, 27.
 — Sorel, 71.
 Aigues-Mortes, 36, 106.
 Aire, 28.
 Aistwulf, 8.
 Aix, 106.
 Aix-la-Chapelle, Treaty of, (1668) 153; (1748) 178, 180.
 Alais, Peace of, 134.
 Alaric II, 4.
 Alberoni, 171.
 Albigenses, the, 22-5, 31-4.
 Albret, House of, 100.
 — Henry d', 101.
 Alcuin, 12.
 Alemannia (Suabia), 8.
 Alesia, 3.
 Alexander I, 229, 233, 254.
 — II, 259, 262, 274.
 Alexandria, battle of, (1801) 156; (1882) 278.
 Alfonse (brother of Louis IX), 34, 36, 39.

Alfonso IX, 32.
 — King of Naples, 90.
 Algiers, 107, 286, 287.
 Almanza, battle of, 165.
 Alsace, 79, 82, 138, 143-8, 155, 216, 268, 270, 273, 281, 292, 293.
 Alva, 115.
 Amadeus of Savoy, 158.
 Amauri de Montfort, 32.
 Amboise, George of, 93.
 — Pacification of, 114.
 — Treaty of, 116.
 — Tumult of, 113.
 America, 90, 159, 160, 176, 183, 208, 209.
 Amiens, 25, 126.
 — Treaty of, (1527) 105.
 Amsterdam, 154.
 Anagni, 43.
 Anastasius, Emperor, 5.
 Andernach, 16.
 Angers, 87.
 — Treaty of, 13, 133.
 Angoulême, Treaty of, 132.
 Anjou, 11, 23, 27, 28, 40, 59, 125.
 — Henry Duke of (Henry III), 116, 120-3.
 Anne of Austria, 132, 135, 137, 140, 147.
 — of Brittany, 89, 93.
 — of Russia, 175.
 Antilles, the, 152.
 Antwerp, 49.
 Aquitaine, 8, 14, 15, 36, 50, 63.
 Arabia, 6.
 Aragon, 37, 39, 40, 85.
 Archbishop of Paris, 173.
 — of Rouen, 151.
 Ardres, Treaty of, 108.

Arles, 14.
 Armada, the, 50.
 Armagnacs, the, 63-6.
 Arnaud Amalric, 31.
 Arques, battle of, 124.
 Arras, 84.
 — Treaty of, (1415), 63, 68, 70, 72; (1480) 86, 87.
 Arthur, Prince, 27.
 Artois, 51, 61, 84, 107, 108, 148.
 — Robert of, 41, 47.
 Assienti Contracts, the, 167.
 Atella, capitulation of, 92.
 Athelstan, 17.
 Athis, Treaty of, 42.
 Augsburg, League of, 1, 157.
 August 10 (1792), 213.
 Augustus, Emperor, 3.
 — II (of Poland), 174.
 — III (of Poland), 174, 179.
 Aumâle, battle of, 125.
 Aurai, battle of, 56.
 Austrasia, 6, 7, 8, 14.
 Austria, 1, 2, 82, 92, 175, 179, 180, 183, 189, 208, 213, 215, 216, 219, 222, 224, 227-9, 233-5, 237, 262, 272, 274, 280.
 Austrian Succession War, the, 167, 171, 175, 179, 180, 189.
 Auvergne, 28, 35.
 Avars, the, 9.
 Avignon, 41, 43, 49.
 Azores, the, 123.

B

Babylonish Captivity, the, 41, 43, 61 n.
 Badajoz, Treaty of, 223.
 Baden, 224, 235.
 — Treaty of, 167.
Bailis, the, 29.
 Bailly (1789), 210.
 Baldwin IV, 27.
 Balliol, John, 47.
 Baltic, the, 228, 229.

Bank of France, 160.
 — of St. Peter, 160.
 Bantry Bay, 231.
 Bar, 174.
 Barante, 246.
 Barbarossa, 106, 107.
 Barbary States, the, 87.
 Barcelona, 37.
 — Treaty of, 86, 91, 105.
 Barnet, battle of, 77.
 Barrier Fortresses, the, 162, 167.
 Bartenstein, Convention of, 229.
 Basel, 138, 143.
 — Council of, 70.
 — Treaties of, 215.
 Basques, the, 3, 9.
 Bastille, the, 59, 132, 146, 191.
 Bautzen, 238.
 Bavaria, 9, 10, 142, 154, 157, 162, 176, 216, 224, 235.
 Baylen, 232.
 Bayonne, 58, 231, 232.
 — Conference, 115.
 Bazaine, 266.
 Beaconsfield, Lord, 278.
 Beatrice of Provence, 36.
 Beaufort, Duc de, 141.
 Beaujeu, Lord, 86.
 — Anne of, 86, 89.
 Beaumarchais, 206.
 Beauvais, 77.
 Becket, Thomas à, 24.
 Bedford, Duke of, 66, 68.
 Belfort, 268.
 Belgium, 201, 208, 214, 215, 222, 249-51, 264, 265, 273, 280.
 Belgrade, Treaty of, 175.
 Belle Isle, 181.
 Benedetti, 264.
 Benedict XI, 43.
 — XII, 49.
 — XIV, 178.
 Beresina, the, 238.
 Berezowski, 262.
 Bergamo, 101.
 Bergerac, Treaty of, 123.
 Berlin, 239, 263, 273.

- Berlin, Treaty of, (1742) 176;
 (1878) 274, 282, 290.
 Bernadotte, 239.
 Bernard VII, Count of Armagnac,
 63.
 — of Septimania, 15.
 Bernard, St., 22.
 Bernard of Saxe-Weimar, 138, 139.
 Berne, 80.
 Bernis, 180.
 Berri, Duc de, 59, 74, 167, 246.
 — Duchesse de, 250.
 Berwick, Treaty of, 51.
 Besançon, 155.
 Béziers, 31.
 Biarritz, 256.
 Billaud-Varennes, 215.
 Bisaccia, Duc de, 275.
 Bismarck, 256, 261 *seq.*, 280, 281.
 Black Prince, the, 51, 57, 58.
 Blanche of Castile, 32, 34, 35, 37.
 — of Navarre, 51.
 Blancmesnil, 145.
 Blenheim, battle of, 164.
 Blois, 132.
 — Treaties of, 94.
 Blücher, 240, 243.
 Boer War, the, 288, 289.
 Bohemond of Tarentum, 19.
 Bologna, 99.
 Bonaparte, 219 (*see* Napoleon).
 Boniface VIII, 41-3.
 Bordeaux, 34, 41, 51, 57, 58, 71,
 73, 147, 267, 268, 292.
 — Duc de, 249.
 Bosnia, 274.
 Bossuet, 150, 191.
 Bouchain, 166.
 Boufflers, 164.
 Boulogne, 27, 108.
 Bourbaki, 267.
 Bourbon, Cardinal of, 123-5.
 — Duke of (c. 1487), 69, 76.
 Bourbonnais, the, 152.
 Bourbons, the, 59, 103, 104, 127,
 165, 172, 242, 243.
 Bourges, 19, 37, 65, 70.
 Bouvines, battle of, 2, 27, 28,
 31.
 Boxers, the, 289.
 Boyne, battle of the, 158.
 Brabant, 61, 84, 153, 164.
 Brandenburg, 152, 157.
 — Albert of, 80.
 Brazil, Prince of, 230.
 Breisach, 155.
 — Old, 155.
 Breisgau, the, 139.
 Breitenfeld, battle of, 137.
 Brest, 58.
 — flotilla, 181.
 Brétigny, preliminaries of peace
 at, 53.
 Brie, 77.
 Brienne, Loménie de, 206, 207,
 209.
 Brihuega, battle of, 166.
 Brille, 118.
 Brissot, 212.
 Brittany, 11, 13-15, 23, 34, 49,
 58, 76, 78, 85, 89, 96, 126, 152,
 154, 171, 187, 217.
 — Duke of, 52, 58, 74.
 Broglie, Duc de, 250, 275.
 Broussel, 145.
 Bruges, 27.
 — Treaty of, 58.
 Brühl, 147.
 Brumaire (18th), Revolution of,
 220.
 Brune, General, 220.
 Brunhilda, 5.
 Brunswick, 154.
 — Duke of, 213.
 Bucharest, Treaty of, 237.
 Buckingham, Marquess of, 230;
 quoted, 205.
 — Earl of, 134.
 Buffet, M., 276.
 Bugeaud, General, 252.
 Burgundy, 4, 6, 8, 14, 55, 96, 102,
 104, 108, 119, 153.
 — Dukes of, 59, 61, 63, 74,
 167.

Butler, the, 29.
 Buzot, 211.
 Byzantine Court, the, 11.

C

Caboche, 63.
 Caen, 87.
 Caesar Borgia, 93.
 Cahors, 122.
 Caillaux, M., 291.
 Cairo, 182.
Caisse d'Escompte, 195.
 Calais, 41, 51, 58, 59, 63, 71, 81, 108, 110.
 — Peace of, 53.
 — Truce of, 50.
 Calonne, 135, 142-4, 146.
 Calvinists, the, 97, 98, 121.
 Cambodia, 279.
 Cambrai, 4, 49.
 — League of, 94.
 — Treaty of, 105.
 Cameroons, the, 288.
 Campo Formio, Treaty of, 219, 220, 230.
 Canada, 90, 160, 168, 169, 176-8, 180, 181, 196, 197, 283.
 Cannes, 242.
 Canterbury, 24, 102.
 Cape Bonavista, 167.
 — Breton Island, 97, 167.
 Capet, House of, 2.
 Carcassonne, 31.
 Carinthia, 109.
 Carloman, 7-9.
 Carnot, (1789 *seq.*) 215; (1875 *seq.*) 276.
 Cartier, J., 97.
 Casale, 134, 136, 148.
 Casimir-Perier, (1875 *seq.*) 250, 276.
 Cassano, battle of, 220.
 Cassel, 27.
 Cassino, 12.
 Castelfidardo, battle of, 257.
 Castile, 49, 57, 85.
 Castlereagh, 241, 242.

Catalonia, 73, 139, 148.
 Cateau-Cambrésis, Treaty of, 110, 113.
 Catharine of France (wife of Henry V), 64.
 Catharine de' Medici, 109, 113, 118-20.
 Catherine I, 172.
 — II, 181, 184, 185, 192, 199, 208, 213.
 Catholic League, the, 137.
 Catholic Reform Bill (English), the, 248.
 Catinat, 158, 162.
 Cavaignac, General, 253.
 Cavour, 242, 254-6.
 Cayenne, 152, 219.
 Cellamare, 171.
 Cerdagne, 86, 148.
 Ceresole, battle of, 108.
 Cevennes, the, 3, 156 n.
 Chaluz, 25.
 Chamberlain, the, 29.
 Chambord, Comte de, 270, 272, 275.
Chambre de St. Louis, 145.
 — *des Comptes*, 44, 145.
 — *des Enquêtes*, 44.
 — *des Requêtes*, 44.
 — *Grand*, 44.
 — *introuvable*, 245.
Chambres de Réunions, 156.
 Champagne, 37, 77, 78, 87.
 Champ-de-Mars, 212.
 Champlain, 160.
 Channel Islands, the, 53.
 'Chanson de Roland', 9, 19.
 Chanzy, 266, 278.
 Charles the Great, 2, 8-13, 31, 37, 103.
 Charles I (England), 133, 134, 144.
 — II (England), 168, 193.
 — II (Spain), 153, 157, 159, 161.
 — III (Spain), 181.
 — IV (Emperor), 47, 57.
 — IV (Spain), 231.
 — V (Emperor), 1, 94, 100-10, 166.

- Charles V (France), 55, 59 *n.*, 72.
 — VI (France), 51, 59, 63-5.
 — VII (France), 65-72.
 — VIII (France), 9, 89-97, 140.
 — IX (France), 113, 117, 118, 120.
 — X (France), 248, 249.
 — X (Sweden), 149.
 — XII (Sweden), 165.
 — VI (Emperor), 161, 166, 171, 175.
 — (Archduke, *temp.* 1800), 235.
 — of Amboise, 84.
 — of Anjou, 36, 40, 42.
 — of Blois, 56.
 — of France (*temp.* Louis XI), 77.
 — of Navarre, 52, 53, 56, 58.
 — of Valois, 45.
 — the Bald, 14-16.
 — the Bold, 14, 72, 74, 83, 84.
 — the Fat, 14, 16.
 — the Simple, 16, 17.
 — Emmanuel of Sardinia, 177.
 — Emmanuel of Savoy, 126, 134, 135.
 — Martel, 6.
 Charlotte of Savoy, 72.
 Charton, 145.
 Chateaubriand, 247.
 Château Gaillard, 27.
 Châtillon, battle of, 71.
 — Conference at, 241.
 Chauvelin, 174, 175.
 Cherasco, Treaty of, 136.
 Cherbourg, 58.
 Chevreuse, Madame de, 146.
 Chiavenna, 103.
 Chièvres, 100.
 Childeric, 7.
 Chilperick, 6.
 China, 278, 287, 288.
 Chinon, 25, 66.
 Chislehurst, 271.
 Choiseul, 2, 181, 184-7.
 Chouart (Grosseilliers), 168.
 Christian IV of Denmark, 260.
 Christina of Savoy, 139.
 Church, the, 17, 190, 191; (after 1871) 248, 276, 277, 284, 285.
 Cialdini, General, 257.
 Cinq Mars, Henry Marquess of, 139.
 Cintra, capitulation of, 232, 233.
 Cissey, General de, 275.
 Civil Constitution, the, 213.
 Clair-sur-Epte, Treaty of, 16.
 Clarendon, Constitutions of, 29.
 Claude, Princess, 94.
 Clémenceau, M., 2, 291.
 Clement V, 43.
 — VI, 51.
 — VII, 104, 105.
 — VIII, 124, 126.
 — XI, 167.
Clericis laicos, 42.
 Clermont, 210.
 Cleves, Duke of, 107.
 Clisson, 61.
 Clito, William, 21.
 Clotaire I, 5.
 — II, 6.
 Clotilde, 4.
 Clovis, 4, 5.
 Clugny de Nuis, 196.
 Cluny, 36.
 Coblenz, 15.
 Cocherel, battle of, 56.
 Cochinchina, 278, 279, 286.
 Cognac, 117.
 — League of, 104, 105.
 Colbert, 128, 150-4, 160.
 Coligny, 114, 116-19.
 Collot d'Herbois, 215.
 Colmar, 138.
 Cologne, 157, 164.
 Combes, M., 285.
 Commerce, Treaty of, with England (1786), 201-2; (1860) 257.
 Communes, Philippe de, 50, 78, 79, 88.
 Committee of Public Safety, 215, 216.
 Commune (1871), the, 268-70.

Compiègne, 52, 68, 146.
Compte rendu, the, 198.
Comtat Venaisin, 40.
 Concini, 132.
 Concordat of 1802, the, 224.
 Condé, Henry of, 121, 122, 131,
 139, 145-9, 151, 154.
 Confederation of the Rhine, 224,
 228.
 Conflans, Treaty of, 75, 77.
 Congo, 286, 292.
Conseil du Roi, 44.
Consilium Aegyptiacum, 182.
 Constable, the, 29.
 Constance of Castile, 24.
 Constantine, Emperor, 10.
 Constantine (Algeria), 251.
 Constantinople, 39, 87, 106, 182,
 199, 220 n., 274.
 Constituent Assembly of 1789,
 123, 200, 212.
 Constitution of 1875, the, 285.
 Consulate, the, 221, 222-7.
 Conti, Prince of, 179, 194.
 Continental System, the, 228 seq.,
 237.
Contrat Social, the, 181, 191.
 Convention, the, 215, 218.
 Copenhagen, battle of, 223.
 — Treaty of, 149.
 Corbeil, Treaty of, 37.
 Corbie, 61, 74, 81.
 Corbière, 247.
 Corfu, 220.
 Corn War, the, 194.
 Coromandel Coast, 182.
 Corsica, 185.
Corvée, the, 195, 209.
 Court of Peers, 30.
 Courtrai, battle of, 41.
 Cravant, battle of, 66.
 Crécy, battle of, 50, 56, 63.
 Crefeld, battle of, 180.
 Cremona, 162.
 Crépy, Peace of, 108.
 Crèvecœur, 85.
 Crillon, 200.

Crimean War, 189, 254, 255, 266, 273.
 Crispi, Signor, 292.
 Cromwell, Oliver, 148, 160.
 Crusade, the First, 19.
 Cuba, 181.
 Cumberland, Duke of, 180.
Curia Regis, 30.
 Cyprus, 36.

D

Dagobert, 6.
 Damietta, 36.
 Dammartin, 75, 85.
 Danes, the, 16.
 Danton, 216.
 Danzig, 214, 229.
 D'Aranda, 185.
 Dauphin, the, 69, 70, 81, 83.
 Dauphiné, 51, 66, 70, 207.
 David Bruce, 48.
 Davout, 239.
 'Day of Dupes,' the, 137.
 D'Aiguillon, 187.
 D'Argenson, 177, 189.
 D'Artois, 210, 246 (*see* Charles V).
 D'Aurelle de Paladines, 266.
 De Broglie, Comte, 179, 180.
 — Duc, 275.
Décade, the, 219.
 Decaen, General, 225.
 Decazes, Élie, Duc, 245, 246.
 — Louis, C. E. A., Duc de Glücks-
 berg, 273, 276.
 D'Enghien, 228.
 D'Estaing, 200.
 De Faily, General, 262.
 De Gramont, Duc, 264.
 D'Havrencourt, 179.
 Delcassé, 3, 288.
 De Monts, 160.
 De Morny, 258.
 Denain, battle of, 166.
 Denmark, 107, 135, 149, 152, 154,
 222, 229, 230, 258-60.
 Dennewitz, 240.
 De Peyronnet, 247.

Derby, Earl of, 50.
 Des Alleurs, 179.
 Dessoles, 246.
 Dettingen, 176.
 Devolution, War of, 152.
 Diamond Necklace, the affair of
 the, 205.
 Diderot, 209.
 Didier, 9.
 Dieppe, 97, 114.
 Diet, the German, 139.
 Diocletian, 4.
 Directory, the, 154, 218-21.
 Doctrinaires, the, 246, 249.
 Dôle, 85.
 Dolet, Étienne, 97.
 Dominica, 200.
 Dominicans, the, 35.
 Donation of Pepin, the, 8, 9.
 Don Carlos, 173, 175.
 Don Luis, 171.
 Doria, Andrea, 105.
 Doubs, valley of the, 268.
 Dover, Secret Treaty of, 154.
 Dresden, 240.
 Dreux, battle of, 114; capture of,
 126.
 Dreyfus, 284, 285, 291.
 Dubois, Cardinal, 171, 172.
 Dubois-Crancé, 211.
 Dufaure, 277.
 Du Guesclin, 56-8.
 Dumbarton Castle, 109.
 Dumouriez, 215, 217.
 Dunkirk, 141, 148.
 Dunois, 75.
 Dupleix, 177, 180, 182.
 Dupont, General, 232.
 Duport, 211.
 Duquesne, 154.
 Dutch, the, 153.

E

Eadgifu, 17.
 East India Company, the French,
 169.

1832.8

East Indies, the, 225, 286.
 Ebro, the, 10, 233.
 Ebroin, 6.
 Economists, the, 191.
 Edict of January 1562, 114.
 Edward I, 40-2, 44, 45.
 — III, 47, 53, 55, 123.
 — IV, 76, 77, 81, 86.
 — VI, 109.
 Egypt, 182, 185, 220, 223, 227,
 277-9, 281, 290.
 Ehrenbreitstein, 138.
 Einhard, 12.
 Elbe, the, 237, 241, 242.
 Eleanor of Aquitaine, 22, 23.
 — daughter of Henry II of Eng-
 land, 32.
 — of Castile, 40.
 Elizabeth, Queen, 114, 115, 118,
 119, 123, 226.
 — of Russia, 181.
 — of Spain, 125.
 — of York, 76.
 Empire, the Austrian, 166.
 — the first French, 228 *seq.*
 — the second French, 265,
 286.
 — the Holy Roman, 37, 85, 215,
 222, 224, 228, 230.
 Ems telegram, the, 264.
 Encyclopaedists, the, 190, 209.
 England, 38, 47, 75, 77, 85, 97, 102,
 112, 126, 134, 150, 153-5, 157-9,
 161, 162, 168, 169, 171, 176, 180,
 185, 197, 199, 200, 204, 212,
 214-17, 220, 222, 226 *seq.*,
 247 *seq.*, 277 *seq.*, 287 *seq.*
 Enrico, Don, 57.
 Erfurt, 234.
 — Treaty of, 292.
 Escorial, Treaty of the, 174.
 Étampes, 147.
 Étampes, Treaty of, 91.
 Étienne Marcel, 52, 53, 189,
 208.
 Etruria, kingdom of, 226.
 Eugène, Prince, 162, 164, 165.

Exhibition, the Great (1867), 262.
Eylau, battle of, 228.

F

Falkland Islands, 185.
Falstaff, Sir John, 66.
Family Compact, the First, 174, 175.
— the Second, 176.
— the Third, 181, 185.
Farmers-General, the, 197.
Fashoda, 288.
Faubourg St. Antoine, battle of the, 147.
Faure, 284.
Favre, Jules, 259.
Fehrbellin, battle of, 154.
Fénelon, 150, 191.
Ferdinand II (Emperor), 98, 135, 136, 142.
— III, 142.
— VII (Spain), 231, 239, 247.
— Archduke, 107.
— of Aragon, 85, 86, 91, 93, 95.
— of Brunswick, 180.
Ferrand of Portugal, 27, 28.
Ferrantino, 91.
Ferry, Jules, 277-9, 280, 286, 287.
Feuillan, the, 211.
Fez, 292.
'Field of Cloth of Gold,' the, 102.
Finale, 161.
First of June, battle of the, 217.
Firth of Forth, 109.
Five Hundred, the, 221.
Five Ordinances, the, 249.
Flanders, 25, 27, 28, 37, 41, 49, 53, 60, 61, 81, 83, 84, 104, 108, 125, 152, 153, 164, 165.
Fleur de Lys, 160.
Fleurus, battle of, 215.
Fleury, 83, 169, 172-6.
Fleury-sur-Loire, Treaty of, 15.
Fleux, Peace of, 123.
Flodden, battle of, 95.
Florence, 100, 105.

Florence, Treaty of, 223.
Flushing, 118.
Fontainebleau, 135.
— Treaty of, 201.
Fontaine-Françoise, campaign of, 126.
Fontanet-en-Puisaye, battle of, 13.
Fontenoy, battle of, 178.
Formosa, 287.
Fort Duquesne, 180.
Fouquet, 151.
Fourier, 252.
France, Isle of, 177.
Francesco Sforza, 90, 91, 104.
Franche-Comté, 84, 86, 148, 153, 155.
Francis I, 96, 97, 101, 106-9.
— II, 113.
Francis Joseph, Emperor, 256.
Francis, Count of Aumale, 109.
Francis of Lorraine, 175.
Francis of Paola, St., 88.
Franciscans, the, 35.
Franconia, Circle of, 157.
Franco-Turkish Treaty (1535), 106.
Frankfort, peace negotiations at, 240, 241.
— Treaty of, 267, 268, 273.
Frederick I (Barbarossa), 23, 24.
— II, 28, 35, 37, 42.
— III, 79.
— VII (Denmark), 258, 259.
— the Great, 176, 181, 201, 202.
— William II, 212.
— William III, 229.
Free Companies, the, 55.
Freiburg, 155.
— Treaty of, 100.
French Revolution, 44, 48, 169 *seq.*, 202 *seq.*
Freycinet, 267, 277, 284.
Friedland, battle of, 229.
Friedlingen, battle of, 164.
Froissart, 50.
Fronde, the, 142, 143, 145, 208, 209.

Fronde, First, War of, 145, 146.
 — the New, War of, 146.
 — Provincial, 147.
Fructidor (18th), 218, 219.
Fuenterria, 171.
Fulk of Anjou, 11, 21.
Furnes, battle of, 42.
Fürstenberg, W. von, 157.
Fürstenbund, the, 201.

G

Gabelle, the, 60.
Gallia, 3.
Gallican Church, the, 70, 117, 127.
Gallo-Narbonensis, 3.
Gambetta, 65, 267, 271, 277-9, 291.
Gambia, the, 283.
Garibaldi, 257, 262.
Garigliano, battle on the, 94.
Gascony, 41, 47, 57, 71.
Gaston de Foix, 95.
 — of Orleans, 135, 140.
Geneva, 98.
 — Treaty of, 100.
Genoa, 66, 103, 105.
Gentz (quoted), 204.
Geoffrey of Anjou, 21.
Germany, 2, 79, 90, 97, 136, 157, 182, 222, 228, 229, 240, 260-74, 279-82, 286-93.
 — Revolution in (1803-6), 224.
Gerona, 40.
Gertruydenberg, 166.
Ghent, 27, 61, 107.
Gian Galeazzo, 90.
Gibraltar, 164, 167, 181, 197.
Gilda, the, 195.
Girondists, the, 212, 215.
Gisors, 22, 23, 25.
 — Treaty of, 21.
Gloucester, Duke of, 66.
Godfrey of Bouillon, 19.
Golden Bull, the, 57.
Gonzaga, Charles, Duke of Nevers, 134.

Gonzaga, Vincenzo di, 134.
Gorce, de (quoted), 257, 258.
Goree, 181, 200.
Gortschakoff, 274.
Granada, Treaty of, 93.
Grand Alliance, the, 157, 162.
Grande Ordonnance of March 1357, 52.
Granson, battle of, 82.
Granville, Lord, 280.
Gravelines, 102, 110.
Great Elector, the, 157.
Greeks, the, 87, 247.
Greenwich, Treaty of, 126.
Gregory VII (Hildebrand), 19, 42.
 — XIV, 124.
Grenada, 181, 200.
Grenoble, 135, 235.
Grenville, Lord, 205, 230.
Grévy, M., 276.
Grey, Sir Edward, 288.
Grisons, the, 103, 134.
Gross-Beeren, 239.
Guadet, 212.
Guelders, 79.
Guérande, Treaty of, 56.
Guérin, 28.
Guiana, 185.
Guienne, 41, 47, 50, 75, 77, 152, 154.
Guinegate, battle of (the Spurs), 95.
Guines, 51, 53.
Guipuzcoa, 161.
Guise, Count of, 103.
 — Francis Duke of, 110, 114.
 — Henry Duke of, 116, 121, 122, 126.
Guises, the, 113, 119, 127.
Guizot, 246, 249-52.
Gustavus III, 187.
 — Adolphus, 136, 137.

H

Habsburg, House of, 101, 118, 127, 129, 137-41.
Hadrian, Pope, 9.

Hague, The, 165, 204.
 Hainan, 288.
 Hainault, 84.
 Hamburg, 239.
 Hanau, battle of, 240.
 Hanotaux, M., 287.
 Hanover, 228.
 Hanseatic League, the, 87.
 Harcourt, 139.
 Harley, 166.
 Harris, Sir J., 204.
 Havana, 181.
 Havre, 71, 114.
 Hébert, 216.
 Heilbronn, League of, 137, 139.
 Heligoland, 283.
 Helvetic Republic, the, 224.
Henriade, La, 191.
 Henrietta Maria, 133.
 Henry I (England), 20, 21, 29.
 — I (France), 18.
 — II (England), 3, 7, 23-5, 29, 34.
 — II (France), 1, 109-11, 113, 125.
 — III (England), 31, 33, 34, 35, 37.
 — III (France), 123, 124.
 — IV (England), 2.
 — IV (France), 96, 99, 124-9, 152, 160.
 — V, Emperor, 21.
 — V (England), 63-5.
 — VI (England), 65, 77.
 — VII (England), 86, 151.
 — VIII (England), 1, 95, 96, 101-3, 107, 108.
 Herrings, battle of the, 66.
 Herzegovina, 274.
 Hesse Cassel, 217.
 Hohenzollern candidature, the (1870), 264.
 Holland, 28, 138, 142, 153-5, 157, 158, 162, 171, 199-205, 214-17, 220, 224, 226, 237, 250, 253, 280.
 Holstein, 260.
 Holy Places, the, 254.
 Honorius III, 32.
 Howe, Admiral, 217.
 Hrolf, 16.

Hudson's Bay, 166, 168.
 Hugh the Great, 17.
 — Capet, 17, 18.
 — of Vermandois, 19.
 Hugonot, 84.
 Huguenots, the, 108, 111, 114, 120, 121, 131-4, 139, 151.
 Humbercourt, 84.
 'Hundred Days,' the, 245.
 Hundred Years' War, the First, 41, 47, 49, 58.
 — the Second, 158, 169, 176, 226, 243.
 Hungary, 107, 155, 164.

I

India, 160, 170, 176-8, 180, 182, 183, 197, 219, 229, 286.
 Indian Mutiny, 256.
 Infanta, the Spanish, 172.
 Ingeborgis, 27.
 Innocent III, 31.
 — IV, 36.
 Innsbruck, 109.
 Inquisition, the, 34, 39.
 Intendants, the, 145.
 Investiture question, the, 19.
 Ireland, 197, 231.
 Isabella of Aragon, 39.
 — of Bavaria, 61.
 — of Burgundy, 55.
 — of Castile, 85, 86.
 — of Hainault, 25.
 Italian League, the, 134.
 Italy, 35, 86, 89-92, 95-7, 135, 136, 158, 159, 164, 165, 219, 220, 224, 230, 231, 253, 255-9, 262, 289.
ius devolutionis, 153.
 Ivory, battle of, 2, 125.
 — Treaty of, 24.

J

Jacobins, the, 12, 125, 212, 219, 242.

Jacobites, the, 167.
 Jacquetta of Luxembourg, 68.
 James I, 133.
 — II, 158, 162, 248.
 James Edward (the Old Pretender), 162, 165.
 James van Artevelde, 49.
 Jansenists, the, 98, 149, 167, 174, 191.
 Japan, 287, 289.
 Jargeau, battle of, 147.
 Jarnac, battle of, 116.
 Jean d'Albret, 85.
 Jean Sans Peur, 62.
 Jeanne (wife of Louis XII), 93.
 Jemappes, battle of, 214.
 Jena, battle of, 228.
 Jerusalem, 22, 23, 36, 91.
 Jesuits, the, 124, 127, 172, 179, 186, 248.
 Joan of Arc, 47, 65-8.
 Joanna of Naples, 60.
 John, King of England, 25, 27, 28, 31.
 — Duke of Normandy, 50; King of France, 51-5.
 — VIII, Pope, 16.
 — XXII, Pope, 49.
 — of Bohemia, 49.
 — of Calabria, 73, 75, 76.
 — of Gaunt, 58.
 — Knox, 41.
 — Montfort, 56.
 — Sigismund, 107.
 — Sobieski, 156.
 Joly de Fleury, 198, 203.
 Joseph II, 73, 192, 193, 195, 199-201, 208.
 — Bonaparte, 232.
 — Father, 136, 139.
 Josephine, 229, 235.
 Juarez, 261.
 Julius Caesar, 3.
 Julius II, 96.
 Junot, 230, 231.
Jurandes, the, 194.

K

Kalisch, Treaty of, 238.
 Kardis, Treaty of, 149.
 Kaunitz, 199.
 Khartoum, 280.
 Kiaochou, 288.
 Kiel Canal, the, 261.
 Klosterzeven, Convention of, 180.
 'Knights of Chivalry,' 55.
 Knights Templars, the, 43, 44.
 Königgratz, battle of (*see* Sadowa).
 Korsakov, 220.
 Kronstadt, 283.
 Kulm, battle of, 240.
 Kutchuk-Kainardji, Treaty of, 188.
 Kwang Chow Wan, 288.

L

La Bicocca, battle of, 102.
 La Bourdonnais, 177, 182.
 La Charité, 117.
 Lafayette, 212, 249, 250.
 La Fère, 122.
 La Forest, 106.
La Henriade, 191.
 La Hire, 66.
 La Hogue, battle of, 158.
 Lally, 183.
 Lambeth, Treaty of, 32.
 La Marck, 118.
 Lamoricière, General, 257.
 Landriano, battle of, 105.
 Langson, defeat at, 278, 280.
 Languedoc, 31, 33, 37, 40, 51, 59, 65, 84.
 La Noue, 119.
 Laon, 16.
 La Pérouse, 200.
 La Rivière, 191.
 La Rochelle, 113, 117, 120, 133, 134.
 — battle of, 58.
 La Sainte Ligue, 122.
 Lateran Council, 32.

- La Trémouille, 93, 95.
 Lauffeldt, battle of, 178.
 Lautrec, 102, 105.
 La Vendée, 250.
 Law, John, 171, 172.
 League, the Catholic, 122-4, 127.
 League of Public Weal, 74.
 League of the Rhine, the, 152.
 Lech, battle of the, 137.
 Lefèvre d'Ormesson, 203.
 L'Hôpital, 113-15, 117.
 Leibnitz, 182.
 Leipzig, battle of, 240, 265.
 Le Mans, 25, 266.
 Lens, battle of, 143.
 Leo III, 10.
 — X, 96, 99, 102.
 Leonora Galigai, 132.
 Leopold I, Emperor, 154-7, 161.
 Leopold of Saxe-Coburg, 250.
 Le Tellier, 167.
 Le Trosni, 191.
Les Importans, 140.
Lettres Philosophiques, 191.
Lettres Provinciales, 149.
 Levant, the, 87.
 Lewis IV, Emperor, 49.
 Liège, 76, 77.
 Ligny, battle of, 243.
 Ligurian Republic, 222, 226.
 Lille, 165.
 Limoges, 57, 116.
 Limousin, 32.
 Lindet, 215.
 Lionne, H. de, 150, 151.
 Lisaine, battle of the, 267.
 Lisbon, 230, 234.
Lit de Justice, 144.
 Loire, Army of the, 266.
 Lombards, the, 7-9.
 Lombardy, 105.
 London, 31, 168, 190, 280.
 — Treaty of, (1359) 51; (1518) 101; (1841) 251.
 Longjumeau, Edict of, 116.
 Longueville, 146.
 Lords, House of, 165.
 Lords of the Lilies, the, 86.
 Lorenzo de' Medici, 90.
 Lorraine, 28, 82, 135, 138, 143, 159, 161, 175, 268, 270, 273, 280, 292, 293.
 — Cardinal of, 116.
 — Charles II of, 126.
 — Duke of, 83, 138, 143, 159, 175.
 Lorris, Treaty of, 36.
 Lothaire, King, 17.
 — Emperor, 13.
 Lotharingia, 14.
 Loubet, 284.
 Loudun, Treaty of, 132.
 Louis II, Emperor, 13.
 — V, 17.
 — VI, 20-5, 30.
 — VII, 22, 30, 33.
 — VIII, 32.
 — IX, 30, 33, 34, 36-9.
 — X, 45, 52.
 — XI, 2, 14, 22, 50, 55, 69, 70, 72-80, 82-8, 93.
 — XII, 89, 90, 92-7, 99.
 — XIII, 97, 99, 131, 132, 134, 138, 140.
 — XIV, 2, 97, 117, 127, 128, 140, 143, 147, 149, 150-67, 169, 170, 172, 182, 183, 189, 193, 209.
 — XV, 140, 149, 170-2, 179, 184, 185, 188-91.
 — XVI, 52, 149, 171, 178, 192-6, 198, 199, 213, 216, 245.
 — XVIII, 241-3, 245, 248.
 — Count of Flanders, 61.
 — Duke of Anjou, 60.
 — d'Outremer, 17.
 — of Baden, 165.
 — the Debonaire, 13.
 — the German, 15, 16.
 — Blanc, 253.
 — Bonaparte, 237.
 — Philippe, 185, 249 *seq.*
 Louisbourg, 177.
 Louise of Savoy, 105.
 Louisiana, 169, 176, 181.
 Louvois, 150.

Lucerne, 80.
 Lucien Bonaparte, 232.
 Ludovico Sforza, 90, 93.
 Lunéville, Treaty of, 223, 224, 227, 232.
 Luther, 97, 101.
 Lutherans, the, 102, 103, 105, 106.
 Lützen, battle of, 238.
 Luxemburg (the Duchy), 110, 222, 262, 264.
 — siege of (1681), 155.
 Luynes, 132, 133.
 Lyons, 82, 87, 128, 137.
 — Lord, 195, 280, 281.

M

Macchiavelli, 115.
 Macdonald, General, 240.
 McMahon, Marshal, 272, 275.
 Madagascar, 152, 290.
 Madame de Maintenon, 156.
 Madame de Prie, 172.
 Madame du Barry, 185.
 Madras, 177.
 Madrid, 103, 233, 234, 237.
 — Treaty of, 104, 106.
 Maestricht, 201.
 Magenta, battle of, 256.
 Magna Carta, 28.
 Magnano, battle of, 220.
 Mahan, Admiral (quoted), 176.
 Mahé, 177.
 Maillotins, the, 60.
 Maine, 23, 27, 28, 38.
 — Duke of, 70.
 — Duke and Duchess of, 171.
 Mainz, 137, 152.
 Malesherbes, 192, 195.
 Malestroit, Truce of, 50.
 Malplaquet, battle of, 166.
 Malta, 159, 220, 226, 228.
 Manila, 181.
 Mantua, 105, 139.
 — Duchy of, 134, 135.
 Marchand, Colonel, 288.

Mardyke, 141, 148.
 Marengo, battle of, 222, 229.
 Margaret of Austria, 86, 94.
 — of Burgundy, 45.
 — of England, 75, 77, 81.
 — of Flanders, 57.
 — of France, 23.
 — of Provence, 35.
 — of Valois, 117, 119.
 Maria Theresa (Austria), 173, 175, 176, 177, 180.
 Maria Theresa (wife of Charles X), 248.
Mariage de Figaro, 206.
 Marie Antoinette, 193, 194, 198, 216.
 Marie de' Medici, 131, 132.
 Marie Leszczyńska, 172.
 Marie Louise, 235.
 Marie Thérèse, 153.
 Marignano, battle of, 99, 108.
 Marillacs, the, 137.
 Marlborough, Duke of, 164-6.
 Marmont, 241.
 Marmouset, the, 61.
 Marrac, Château de, 231.
 Marsaglia, battle of, 158.
 Marseilles, 3.
 Martignac, 248.
 Martin IV, Pope, 40.
 Martinique, 181, 185.
 Mary (d. of James II), 154.
 — of Burgundy, 83, 84.
 — of Lorraine, 109.
 — Queen of England, 1, 101.
 — Queen of Scots, 109, 113.
 Mary Tudor (sister of Henry VIII), 96.
 Masséna, 220.
 Matilda, Empress, 21.
 Matthew Paris, 33.
 Maupéou, 187, 188.
 Maurepas, 193, 195, 196, 198, 199.
 Maurice of Saxony, 109.
 Maximilian, Archduke, 84, 85.
 — Emperor, 91, 101.
 — Emperor of Mexico, 261, 262.

- Maximilian of Bavaria, 136, 142, 162, 164.
 Mayenne, Duc de, 124-6.
 Mayors of the Palace, 6.
 Mazarin, 2, 137, 140-51, 182.
 Meaux, 53, 108.
 — Conspiracy of, 115, 116.
 — Treaty of, 34, 36.
 Medici, the, 100.
 Mediterranean, the, 105, 106, 139, 158, 161, 182, 185, 220, 226, 234.
 Mehemet Ali, 251.
 Melanchthon, 97.
Mémoire sur les Colonies (Vauban), 182.
 Mercœur, 125, 126.
 Mergentheim, battle of, 141.
 Merovingians, the, 4-6.
 Mersen, Treaty of, 16.
 Messina, 25.
 Metternich, 239, 240.
 Metz, 110, 142, 155, 187, 267, 270.
 Meulan, Count of, 28.
 Mexico, 261, 265.
 — Civil War in, 258, 260, 261.
 Michieli, 119.
 Milan, 90, 91, 93, 94, 100-3, 105, 108, 162.
 — Convention of, 165.
 Milanese, the, 93, 161.
 Minorca, 167, 180, 197.
 Mississippi, the, 161, 169, 176.
 Modena, 139.
 Molé, 251.
 Moltke, von, 268.
 Moncada, 104.
 Monçon, Treaty of, 134.
 Moncontour, battle of, 117.
 Mons, 118.
 Mons-en-Pevèle, battle of, 42.
 Monsieur, Peace of, 121.
 Montauban, 117, 120, 133.
 Montbarrey, 196.
 Montbéliard, 138.
 Montcalm, 182.
 Mont Cenis, 16-
 Montdidier, 74, 81.
 Montebello, battle of, 222, 256.
 Montereau-sur-Yonne, 64, 65.
 Montesquieu, 190, 191.
 Montfort, John de, 56.
 — Simon de, 31, 32.
 Montl'héri, battle of, 75.
 Montmorency, 114, 116; (Francis) 117.
 Montmorency, Mathieu de, 247.
 Montmorin, 202, 205.
 Montpellier, 51.
 — Treaty of, 133.
 Montpensier, Duke of, 117.
 — Mlle de, 171.
 Montserrat, 200.
 Moore, Sir John, 234.
 Morat, battle of, 82, 83.
 Morocco, 290, 292.
 Moscow, 237.
 Moselle, the, 268.
 Mukden, battle of, 290.
 Munster, 139, 142.
 Murat, 232.
- N
- Namur, 158.
 Nancy, 82, 83.
 Nantes, the Edict of, 127, 128; Revocation of, 156.
 Naples, 73, 75, 90-2, 100, 107, 110, 162, 215, 223, 232, 235.
 Napoleon I, 2, 9, 11, 27, 138, 158, 164, 185, 215, 220, 222 *seq.* (*see* Bonaparte).
 — III, 184, 254 *seq.*
 Narbonne, 7.
 Nassau, Louis of, 116, 118.
 National Convention, 245.
 Navarino, battle of, 249.
 Navarre, 59, 85, 100, 101, 102.
 — Antony of, 114.
 — Henry of, 114, 117-19, 121-4 (*see* Henry IV).
 Necker, 192, 193, 196-9, 203, 204.
 Neerwinden, battle of, 215.
 Nelson, Lord, 158.
 Nemours, Duc de, 250, 251.

Nesle, 77.
 Netherlands, the, 85, 100, 101, 107,
 122, 123, 127, 141, 149, 164, 182.
 — the Spanish, 138, 142, 153.
 Neuss, 80, 81, 200.
 Neustria, 6, 7, 14.
 Nevers, 61.
 Neville's Cross, battle of, 50.
 New England, 161.
 — France, 97, 160.
 — Hebrides, 290.
 — Orleans, 181.
 Newfoundland, 97, 166, 168.
 New Learning, 98.
 Ney, 170, 240, 245.
 Nice, 106, 165, 257.
 — Treaty of, 106.
 Nicholas I, 254.
 — II, 285.
 Nicopolis, battle of, 62.
 Niemen, the, 237.
 Niger, the, 287.
 Nigeria, 290.
 Nile, battle of the, 220.
 — valley of the, 288.
 Nimeguen, Peace of, 155.
 Nîmes, 120, 128.
 Nogaret, 43.
 Nogent, 61.
 Nördlingen, battle of (1645), 141.
 Normandy, 23, 27, 28, 38, 56, 58,
 64, 75, 76, 125, 154.
 Northern League, 223, 225.
 Notables, meeting of the, 204.
 Notre-Dame, 33.
 Novara, battle of, 95.
 Nova Scotia (Acadia), 168.
 November 16 and 19, Decrees of,
 214.
 Novi, battle of, 220.
 Noyon, Peace of, 100, 101.

O

Odilon Barrot, 252.
 Odo of Paris, Count, 15.
 Ohio, the, 176.

Oldenburg, 237.
 Oliva, Treaty of, 149.
 Ollivier, 257, 259, 264.
 Olmütz Convention, 253.
 Omer Talon, 144.
 Orbitello, battle of, 141.
 Ordinance of 1220, the, 29.
Ordonnance de la Gendarmerie, 69.
 Orleanists, the (after 1871), 275.
 Orleans, 5, 37, 113, 114, 117.
 — Duchess of, 157.
 — Duke of (c. 1634), 138.
 — Louis, Duke of, 61–3, 89.
 — Regent, 167, 170, 171.
 — Siege of, 66.
 Orsini, 256.
 Osnabrück, 142.
 Ostend, 165.
 Ostrogoths, the, 4.
 Otto IV, 28.
 Ottoman Empire, 219.
 Oudenarde, battle of, 165.
 Oudinot, 239.
 Oxenstierna, 137, 138.
 Oxford, 241.

P

Paderborn, 10.
 Palatinate, the, 157.
 Palermo, 253.
 Palestine, 25, 36.
 Palmerston, Lord, 260.
 Pampeluna, 59.
 Panama Canal, 284.
Panther, the, 292.
 Papacy, the, 127, 186, 224, 233,
 255, 257.
 Papal Schism, the, 61 *n*.
 Pardo, Convention of the, 172.
 Paris, 5, 13, 15, 51–3, 59, 60, 62,
 63, 65, 69, 73–5, 103, 119, 125–7,
 140, 144, 145, 147, 150, 262, 265
 seq.
 — Comte de, 270, 275.
 — Treaty of, (1259) 38, 39; (1303)
 41; (1657) 148; (1763) 181,

- 184, 186; (1814) 241; (1815) 243; (1856) 254.
 Paris, University of, 87.
Parlement of Paris, the, 43, 44, 87, 104, 123, 127, 138, 140, 144-7, 150, 170, 171, 173, 174, 178, 184, 186-8.
Parlements (provincial), 116, 150, 170, 187, 188.
 Parliament of 1295 (England), 43.
 — the English, 144.
 Parma, 125, 139, 173, 175.
 Particelli d'Émery, 144.
 Partition Treaties, 161.
 Pascal, 149.
 Passau, Treaty of, 110.
 'Pastoureaux,' the, 37.
 Patay, battle of, 68.
 Paul I, 220, 223.
 Paul the Deacon, 12.
Paulette, the, 128.
 Pavia, 7, 9, 14.
 — battle of, 103.
 Peasants' War, the, 103.
 Pedro, Don (the Cruel), 57.
 — of Aragon, 31.
 Peking Expedition, the, 289.
 Pembroke, Lord, 58.
 Peninsular War, the, 12.
 Pepin I, 6.
 — II, 6.
 — III, 7.
 Périgord, 32.
 Péronne, 56, 74, 76, 121.
 Perpignan, 107.
 Persia, 229.
 Pescadores, the, 287.
 Peter III (Aragon), 38, 40.
 — III (Russia), 181.
 — of Hagenbach, 80.
 Philip I (France), 18, 19.
 — II (Augustus), 2, 24, 25, 27-33.
 — II (Spain), 109, 123, 125, 126.
 — III (France), 39, 40.
 — IV (France), 2, 40-5.
 — IV (Spain), 132, 153.
 — V (France), 45, 47.
 Philip V (Spain), 162, 166, 173.
 — VI (Valois), 47-51, 59.
 — Duke of Burgundy, 51, 55, 60, 61, 64, 68, 72, 74, 77.
 — Hurepel, 34, 35.
 — Duke of Anjou, 161.
 — (son of Mary of Burgundy), 94.
 — van Artevelde, 60, 61.
 Philippsburg, 138, 148, 155, 157.
 Piacenza, 106, 175.
 Picardy, 28, 77, 78, 103, 119.
 — League of, 122.
 Pichon, M., 291.
 Picquart, General, 291.
 Picquigny, Peace of, 81.
 Piedmont, 106, 136, 158, 165, 227, 257.
 Pignerol, 151.
 Pinerolo, 135, 136, 142.
 Pinkie, battle of, 109.
 Pisa, 95.
 Piteous Peace, the, 76.
 Pitt, William, 214.
 Pius VII, 233, 235.
 Pläswitz, armistice of, 238.
 Plombières, 256.
 Poissy, Colloquy of, 113.
 Poitiers, battle of, 6, 51, 56, 58, 113, 117.
 Poitou, 27, 28, 32, 35, 38, 53, 132.
 Poland, 120, 149, 156, 173, 174, 179, 184, 185, 250, 258, 259, 260, 292.
 — Second and Third Partitions of, 97, 216.
 Polignac, Prince de, 248.
 Polish Succession War, the, 173, 174.
Politiques, the, 117, 121, 140, 141.
 Pompey, 3.
 Pomponne, A. de, 150.
 Pondicherry, 159, 169, 177.
 Ponthieu, County of, 53.
 Port Arthur, 287.
 — Nelson, 169.
 Port-Royal, 167.
 Portsmouth, 283.

- Portugal, 57, 97, 139, 148, 164, 167,
215, 223, 230, 231.
Pouilly, Treaty of, 64.
Pragmatic Sanction (of Bourges),
70, 73; (1516) 100; (Austrian)
173, 175.
Prague, 176.
— battle of, 142.
Praguerie, the, 69, 70.
Presbyterianism, 45, 109.
Pressburg, Treaty of, 228.
Press Law, the, 248.
Prévois, the, 29.
Pricurs, the, 215.
Prince Regent, the (George IV),
242.
Protestant Union, the, 129.
Provence, 5-7, 38, 87, 165.
Prussia, 2, 167, 184, 216, 217, 224,
228, 234, 237, 243, 247, 254,
262 *seq.*, 292, 293.
Pyrenees, the, 152.
— Peace of the, 140, 148, 149.

Q

- Quadruple Alliance, the, 171.
Quebec, 160, 168, 181.
Quesnay, F., 191.
Quesnoy, 166.
Quiberon Bay, battle of, 181.

R

- Rabelais, 98.
Radisson, 168.
Ratisbon, Truce of, 156, 157.
Raucoux, battle of, 178.
Ravallac, 129.
Ravenna, 8, 95.
Raymond IV, Count of Toulouse,
19.
— VI, 31.
— VII, 34, 35.
Red Sea, the, 182.
Redesdale, Lord (quoted), 260 *n.*
Reformation, the, 96, 97.

- Reform Movement (England), 249.
Reginald of Boulogne, 27.
Reichenbach, Treaty of, 239.
Reinach, Joseph (quoted), 260.
Remigius, 4.
Renaissance (twelfth century), 22.
— the French, 92, 96-8.
— the Italian, 90, 92.
René of Lorraine, 79, 83.
Restoration, the First, 241.
— the Second, 243, 245.
Rethel, 61.
Retz, Cardinal, 145-7.
Revolution, the French, 1, 44, 96-
8, 100, 192, 195, 196, 202, 208
seq.
— the English (1688), 153.
— of 1848, 253.
— of Three Days, 249.
Rheims, 5, 51, 56, 68.
— Cathedral of, 22.
Rhenish Confederacy, 138.
Rhine, 176, 219, 262.
Rhône, battle on the (1569),
117.
Richard I, 25, 36.
— II, 62.
Richelieu, Cardinal, 2, 44, 120,
128, 133-40, 144, 160.
— Duc de (1696-1788), 180, 182.
— Duc de (1766-1822), 245, 246.
Richemont, 71.
Ried, Treaty of, 240.
Rivoli, Treaty of, 139.
Robespierre, 191, 217.
Robert of England, 21.
— of Flanders, 19, 24.
— the Pious, 18.
— the Strong, 15, 16.
— Duke of France, 16, 17.
Rocroi, battle of, 141.
Röderer, 232.
Roger de Loria, 40.
Roliça, 232.
Romagna, 95.
Rome, 104, 256, 264.
Rooke, Admiral, 164.

Roosebeke, battle of, 61.
 Roosevelt, Theodore, quoted, 204.
 Rossbach, battle of, 180.
 Rouen, 15, 25, 27, 60, 64, 74, 78, 96.
 Rouher, 258.
 Rousseau, 96, 98, 181, 183.
 Roussillon, 37, 73, 86.
 Rouvier, M., 290.
 Roye, 77, 81.
 Royer-Collard, 246.
 Rudolf, Duke of Burgundy, 17.
 Rueil, Treaty of, 143, 146.
 Rupert, Prince, 168.
 Russell, Earl, 259.
 — Lord Odo, 274.
 Russia, 172, 181, 208, 220, 228,
 246, 250, 254, 259, 264, 274 *seq.*,
 285-7.
 Ryswick, Peace of, 157, 159, 161.

S

Saarbrücken, battle of, 265.
 Sadowa, 259, 262, 267.
 Saigon, 286.
 Saint-Contest, 179.
 Saint-Cyr, 246.
 Saint-Denis, 8.
 — battle of, 116.
 Sainte Chapelle, 22, 33.
 Saintes, battle of, 35.
 Saint-Germain, Peace of, 117.
 Saint-Jean-d'Acre, 37.
 Saint-Jean-d'Angely, 117.
 Saintonge, 160.
 Saint-Pol, 75, 76, 81, 82, 105.
 Saint-Simon, 252.
 St. André, Marshal, 114.
 St. Bartholomew, Massacre of,
 118, 119, 121, 186.
 St. Cloud, battle of, 63.
 St. Dominique, 185.
 St. Gotthard, battle of, 152.
 St. Helena, 243.
 St. John, 166.
 St. Lawrence, the, 97.
 — Gulf of, 181.

St. Lucia, 181, 241.
 St. Malo, 34, 97.
 St. Omer, 28, 84.
 St. Pierre, 181.
 St. Quentin, battle of, 77, 81, 110.
 St. Vincent, 181.
 Saladin, 25.
 Salamanca, battle of, 237.
 Salic Law, the, 46.
 Salisbury, Earl of, (1214) 28;
 (1428) 66.
 — Marquess of, 281, 283.
 Sancerre, 120.
 Sandwich, 102.
 Saracens, the, 16, 37.
 Saragossa, 233.
 Sardinia, 171, 177, 217, 219, 243,
 254, 255, 259.
 Sarrien, M., 291.
 Savona, 94.
 Savoy, 79, 105, 106, 164, 165, 214,
 217, 256, 257.
 — Duke of, 159.
 Saxe, Marshal, 177.
 Saxons, the, 8.
 Saxony, 152, 157.
 Scharnhorst, 238.
 Scheldt, opening of the, 214.
 Schism, the Papal, 62.
 Schleswig, 258-60.
 Schnaebeler, 281.
 Schönbrunn, Treaty of, 235.
 Schouvaloff, 274.
 Scotland, 24, 41, 48, 49, 51, 53,
 95, 109, 111, 165.
 Sebastiani, 225.
 Sebastopol, 254.
 Second Coalition, war of the, 220.
 Sedan, battle of, 259, 265, 266.
 Séguier, 151.
 Ségur, Comte de, 196.
 Seize Mai, 276.
 Seneschal, the, 29.
 Senlis, Treaty of, 86 *n.*, 92.
 Septennate, the, 275.
 Septimania, 5.
 Serres, 267.

Seven Years' War, the, 1, 169, 170, 178, 179, 183.
 Seychelles, the, 241.
 Shimonoseki, Treaty of, 287.
 Siam, 159, 287, 290.
 Sicilian Vespers, the, 40.
 Sicily, 40, 43, 91, 93, 100, 107, 110, 162, 171.
 Sierra Leone, 283.
 Sigebert, 5.
 Sigismund of Austria, 79, 82.
 Silesia, 176, 179, 180.
 Simon, Jules, 259, 276.
 'Sixteen,' the, 125, 126.
 Sixtus V, 124.
 Skierniewice, 281.
 Sluys, battle of, 49.
 Smith, Sir S., 231.
 Soissons, 5.
 — battle of, 86.
 — Congress at, 172.
 Solferino, battle of, 256.
 Somerset, Protector, 109.
 Somme Towns, the, 69, 72, 73.
 Sorbonne, the, 87, 97, 127.
 Soult, 234, 251.
 Spain, 57, 58, 86, 92, 100-3, 107, 118-21, 123, 125-7, 153-7, 159-73, 176, 215, 217, 223, 226, 228, 229, 231-9, 247, 267, 289.
 Spanish Succession, the, 153, 156 *n.*, 161, 163, 168-70, 226.
 — Marriages, the, 251.
 — Netherlands, the, 138, 142, 153.
 Stanislaus Leszczyński, 174.
 States-General (France), 43, 45, 48, 52, 59, 71, 170; (1561) 113; (1576) 121; (1590) 126.
 — (United Provinces), 162.
 Steenkerke, battle of, 158.
 Stein, 240.
 Stephen (King of England), 75.
 — of Blois, 19.
 Stettin, 239.
 Stockach, battle of, 222.
 Stralsund, 228.
 Strassburg, 13, 110, 155, 159.

Suez Canal, the, 274, 278.
 Suffolk, Duke of, 68.
 Suger, 2, 23.
 Sulciman I, 105, 106.
 Sully, 2, 128.
 Suworóv, 220.
 Sweden, 153, 154, 157, 179, 184, 185, 217, 222, 228-30, 237, 239.
 Swiss League, the, 80.
 Switzerland, 79, 81, 82, 93, 96, 100, 220, 226, 227.
 Syria, 219, 251.

T

Taboureau, 196.
 Tagus, the, 230.
 Taille, the, 69.
 Taillebourg, skirmish at, 35.
 Talbot, 68, 71.
 Talleyrand, 2, 186, 234, 245.
 Tancred, 19.
 Tauroggen, 238.
 Tavannes, Marshal, 109.
 Teligny, 118, 119.
 Templars, Order of the, 45.
 Ten Free Towns, the, 143.
 Terray, 187, 188.
 Teschen, Treaty of, 199, 200.
 Testry, battle of, 6.
 Tewkesbury, battle of, 77.
 Theodoric IV, 5.
 Theodulfus, Bishop, 12.
 Thermidor, Revolution of, 216.
 Théroutanne, battle of, 85, 95, 110.
 Thiers, 2, 249-52, 259, 265, 267, 271.
 Third Coalition, the, 228.
 Thirty Years' War, the, 1, 133, 135 *seq.*
 Tilly, 137.
 Tinchebrai, battle of, 21.
 Tilsit, Treaty of, 223, 233.
 Tirard-Constat Ministry, 282.
 Tobago, 200, 241.
 Tolbiac, battle of, 4.
 Tongking, 279, 286.

Töplitz, Treaty of, 240.
 Torcy, 165.
 Torstenson, 141.
 Tortosa, 142.
 Toul, 110, 142.
 Toulon fleet, 181.
 Toulouse, 15, 24, 31, 32, 33.
 Touraine, 23, 27, 28.
 Tournai, 101, 102, 104, 155.
 Tours, 5, 25, 74, 89, 95, 266.
 — Truce of, 70.
 Trafalgar, battle of, 158, 227, 228.
 Transylvania, Prince of, 141.
 Trebbia, battle of the, 220.
 Trier, 79, 138.
 Trieste, 235.
 Triple Alliance, the, (1668) 153 ;
 (1717) 121 ; (1788) 203 ; (1914)
 290.
 Tripoli, 288.
 Triumvirate, the, 187, 267.
 Trivulzio, 93.
 Trochu, General, 266.
 Trois Évêches, 109, 110.
 Troyes, Treaty of, 64, 65.
 Tunis, 106, 196, 282, 286.
 Turenne, 139, 141, 142, 147, 148,
 154.
 Turgot, 186, 189, 192-8, 204,
 205.
 Turin, 139.
 — battle of, 165.
 — Treaty of, 174, 257.
 Turkey, 62, 103, 105-7, 119, 155-7,
 175, 184, 185, 199, 200, 203,
 228, 229, 254, 274, 278, 282.
 Tuscan Ports, the, 161, 175.
 Tuscany, 93, 215, 235.
 Two Sicilies, the, 38, 91, 93, 101,
 175, 223, 257.
 Tyrol, the, 93, 164, 235.

U

Ulm, 228.
 — Treaty of, (1647) 142.
 University of Paris, 31, 62, 87.

Upper Rhine, Circle of, 157.
 Urban II, 19.
 Utrecht, Peace of, 182.

V

Vacherot, M., 291.
 Valençay, 232.
 Valencia, 103.
 Valenciennes, 119.
 Valmy, battle of, 2.
 Vandamme, 240.
 Vassy, Massacre of, 114.
 Vauban, 128, 150, 182.
 Vaucelles, Truce of, 110.
 Vendôme, Treaties of, 34.
 Venice, 90, 92, 94, 101, 103, 107,
 119, 256, 262.
 Vera Cruz, 261.
 Vercingetorix, 3.
 Verdun, 2, 110, 142.
 — Treaty of, 13, 14.
 Vergennes, 2, 192, 199-204.
 Verneuil, battle of, 66.
 Verona, Congress of, 247.
 Versailles, 152, 180, 207.
 — Treaty of, (1756 and 1757) 180 ;
 (1783) 200, 202.
 Vervins, Treaty of, 126.
 Vesoul, 84.
 Vexin, the, 25.
 Victor Amadeus I, 135.
 — — II, 165.
 — — III, 248.
 — Emmanuel II, 257.
 Victoria, Queen, 274, 283.
 Vienna, 141, 156, 164.
 — Third Treaty of, 174, 175.
 Vigo Bay, 164.
 Villafranca, armistice of, 256.
 Villars, 164, 166.
 Villaviciosa, battle of, 152, 166.
 Villèle, 247.
 Villemur, battle of, 125.
 Villeneuve, Guillaume de, 92.
 Villeroy, 162, 164.
 Vimiero, 232.

Vincy, battle of, 6.
 Visigoths, the, 36.
 Vivarais, the, 152.
 Viviani, M., 291.
 Vizille, 207.
 Voltaire, 57, 183, 186, 189-91.
 Vouillé, 5.

W

Waddington, M., 277.
 Wagram, battle of, 235.
 Walcheren expedition, 235.
 Waldeck-Rousseau, 285.
 Wallenstein, 136, 137.
 Walpole, Robert, 169.
 Wars of Religion, 113-27.
 Wars of the Roses, 72, 151.
 Warwick, Earl of, 77.
 Wat Tyler, 60.
 Waterloo, battle of, 243.
 Wei-Hai-Wei, 288.
 Wellington, Duke of, 237, 243, 248.
 Wenzel, Emperor, 62.
 West India Company, 160.
 Westminster, Treaty of (1756), 180.
 Westphalia, Treaties of, 140, 142, 143, 145, 157.
 White Ship, the, 21.

White Terror, the, 245.
 Whitworth, Lord, 224, 225.
 Wilhelmina of Holland, 202.
 William I (England), 18.
 — I (Germany), 268.
 — I (Holland), 250.
 — II (England), 22.
 — II (Germany), 283.
 — III (England), 154, 157-9, 161, 162.
 William I of Orange (1558-84), 116, 120, 123.
 William V (Stadtholder), 202, 203.
 Windsor, Treaty of, 103.
 Wittenberg, 239.
 Würtemberg, 224, 235.
 Würzburg, 137.

Y

York, General von, 238.
 Ypres, 27.
 Yve-Saint-Baron, Truce of, 41.

Z

Zacharias, Pope, 7.
 Zanzibar, 283.
 Zurich, 80.
 — Treaty of, 256.
 Zusmarshausen, battle of, 142.
 Zutphen, 79.

Uniform with this Volume

- THE EVOLUTION OF PRUSSIA, the Making of an Empire. By J. A. R. MARRIOTT and C. GRANT ROBERTSON. 1915. Second Impression 1917. Pp. 460, with eight maps. 6s. 6d. net.
- THE BALKANS, a History of Bulgaria, Serbia, Greece, Roumania, Turkey. By NEVILL FORBES, A. J. TOYNBEE, D. MITRANY, and D. G. HOGARTH. 1915. Third Impression 1918. Pp. 408, with three maps. 6s. 6d. net.
- A HISTORY OF RUSSIA from the Varangians to the Bolsheviks. By C. RAYMOND BEAZLEY, NEVILL FORBES, and G. A. BIRKETT, with an introduction by E. BARKER. 1918. Pp. xxii + 602, with six maps. Price 8s. 6d. net.
- ITALY, Mediaeval and Modern, a History by E. M. JAMISON, C. M. ADY, K. D. VERNON, and C. SANFORD TERRY. 1917. Pp. viii + 564, with eight maps and a preface by H. W. C. DAVIS. 7s. 6d. net.
- PORTUGAL OLD AND YOUNG: An Historical Study by GEORGE YOUNG. 1917. Pp. viii + 342, with a frontispiece and five maps. 6s. 6d. net.
- THE GUARDIANS OF THE GATE: Historical Lectures on the Serbs. By R. G. D. LAFFAN, with a foreword by Vice-Admiral E. T. TROUBRIDGE. 1918. Pp. 300, with twenty-two illustrations and three maps. 6s. 6d. net.
- JAPAN, the Rise of a Modern Power. By ROBERT P. PORTER. 1918. Pp. xii + 362, with five illustrations and five maps. 6s. 6d. net.
- THE EASTERN QUESTION. A History of the Ottoman Turks and of European Diplomacy in the Balkans to 1917. By J. A. R. MARRIOTT. 1917. With eleven maps. 8s. 6d. net.
- THE GREAT EUROPEAN TREATIES of the Nineteenth Century, edited by Sir AUGUSTUS OAKES and R. B. MOWAT, with an introduction by Sir H. ERLE RICHARDS. 1918. Pp. xii + 404, with ten maps. 7s. 6d. net.
- WAR SPEECHES OF WILLIAM PITT. Selected with an introduction and a running commentary by R. COUPLAND. Second edition, 1916. Pp. 408, with a portrait of Pitt. Cloth, 3s. 6d. net.
- CARLYLE'S *FREDERICK THE GREAT*. Abridged and edited by A. M. D. HUGHES. 1916. Introduction pp. xxxii, Text pp. 326, Notes pp. 327-76, with seven maps and plans. 3s. 6d. net.

